

3787. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Massachusetts, favoring increased pay for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3788. Also, petition of the Private Soldiers' and Sailors' Legion, favoring \$500 cash bonus for service men; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3789. By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of 44 members of Clerfork Grange, of Butler, Ohio, protesting against the passage of the Nolan bill, H. R. 12397; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3790. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of the Merchants' Association of New York and the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, opposing blanket bonus to veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3791. Also, petition of the Twentieth Assembly Republican Club of New York, relative to increased pay for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3792. Also, petition of the Cloak and Suit Tailors' Union, Local 9, New York, favoring amnesty for political prisoners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3793. By Mr. DARROW: Petition of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, protesting against general cash bonus; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3794. By Mr. DYER: Petition of 13 individuals or corporations of St. Louis, Mo., in connection with soldiers' bonus legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3795. Also, petition of six individuals and associations of St. Louis, Mo., in connection with postal matters; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3796. Also, petitions of the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce against, and the Inland Machine Works in favor of, the adoption of the metric system; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

3797. Also, petition of three individuals of St. Louis, Mo., opposing proposed patent legislation; to the Committee on Patents.

3798. Also, petition of the Missouri Branch, American Legion, in connection with various legislation affecting soldiers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3799. Also, petition of the St. Louis executive committee, American Legion, protesting against House resolution 549; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3800. Also, petition of the Amalgamated Sheet Metal Workers of Springfield, Mo., favoring amnesty to political prisoners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3801. Also, petition of the Advertising Club of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against proposed tax on advertising; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3802. Also, petition of the Western Coal & Mining Co., of St. Louis, Mo., against seasonal freight rates for coal; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3803. By Mr. ESCH: Petition of the board of managers of the New York Produce Exchange, in opposition to bonus legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3804. Also, petition of Local Union No. 310, International Molders' Union, of Racine, Wis., favoring release of political prisoners and the repeal of the espionage act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3805. By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, opposing a cash bonus to ex-service men; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3806. Also, petition of the Woelfel Leather Co., of Morris, Ill., opposing a tax on sales of certificates of indebtedness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3807. Also, petition of Barnhart Bros. & Spindler, of Chicago, Ill., opposing retroactive tax on industries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3808. Also, petition of Frank W. Thomas, of Chicago, and the Chicago Board of Trade, opposing tax on transactions of boards of trade and produce exchanges; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3809. Also, petition of Col. Foreman, of Chicago, commander American Legion, favoring fourfold plan for optional beneficial legislation for ex-service men; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3810. By Mr. JOHNSTON of New York: Petition of the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, New York, and Manufacturers and Dealers' League, favoring increased pay for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3811. By Mr. MAHER: Petition of sundry citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring an increase in salaries for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3812. By Mr. MONAHAN of Wisconsin: Petition of people of the district for passage of House bill 3259; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3813. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Letters and resolutions from sundry citizens of New York, opposing the proposed bonus for soldiers plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3814. Also, sundry letters and petitions from citizens of New York, favoring increased compensation for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3815. Also, petition of the Cloak and Suit Tailors' Union of New York City, favoring the passage of Senate joint resolution 171 and Senate bill 1233; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3816. By Mr. PAIGE: Evidence in support of House bill 14169, granting a pension to Adelia J. Fiske; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3817. By Mr. RAKER: Petition of C. S. Foster, president B. of R. T. Lodge 458, of Dunsmuir, Calif., protesting against the passage of the Army reorganization bill and urging its defeat; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3818. Also, petition of 600 railroad shop employees of Dunsmuir, Calif., opposing the passage of the Army reorganization bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3819. By Mr. RIORDAN: Petition of sundry citizens of New York, opposing stock-sales tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3820. By Mr. ROWE: Petition urging the passage of H. R. 13334; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

3821. By Mr. SNELL: Petition of sundry citizens of the counties of Clinton, Essex, and Franklin, N. Y., protesting against the deferred payment of the interest due on loans made to Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3822. Also, petition of sundry citizens of the counties of Clinton, Essex, and Franklin, requesting the passage of the Mason bill, for recognition of the Irish republic by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3823. By Mr. TAGUE: Petition of the Industrial Accident Board of Boston, Mass., favoring the industrial vocational training bill, H. R. 4438; to the Committee on Education.

3824. By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of the Aero Club of Boston, Mass., favoring separate air service for Army and Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3825. Also, petition of the Housekeepers' League of Boston, Mass., protesting against profiteering; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, May 22, 1920.

(Legislative day of Friday, May 21, 1920.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

NATIONAL PROHIBITION (S. DOC. NO. 277).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$1,500,000, required by the Bureau of Internal Revenue for the employment of guards and watchmen, and other expenses necessary in the prevention of violations of the "national prohibition act," being for the fiscal year 1921, which, with accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House agrees to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 327) terminating the state of war declared to exist April 6, 1917, between the Imperial German Government and the United States, permitting on conditions the resumption of reciprocal trade with Germany, and for other purposes.

The message also returned to the Senate, in compliance with its request, the bill (S. 4332) to exchange the present Federal building and site at Gastonia, N. C., for a new site and building.

The message further announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12626) for the relief of certain persons to whom, or their predecessors, patents were issued to public lands along the Snake River in the State of Idaho under an erroneous survey made in 1883.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 13558. An act for the purpose of improving the facilities and service of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, and of further amending and modifying the war-risk insurance act, as amended; and

H. R. 13627. An act to amend paragraph (e) of section 7 of the act approved March 3, 1919, entitled "An act to authorize

the Secretary of the Treasury to provide hospital and sanatorium facilities for discharged sick and disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines."

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 5163. An act authorizing certain tribes of Indians to submit claims to the Court of Claims, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7629. An act to amend the penal laws of the United States;

H. R. 10072. An act to provide for the punishment of officers of United States courts wrongfully converting moneys coming into their possession, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12044. An act to accept the cession by the State of California of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Yosemite National Park, Sequoia National Park, and General Grant National Park, respectively, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13665. An act granting the consent of Congress to Muskogee County, Okla., to construct a bridge across the Arkansas River between sections 16 and 21, township 15 north, range 19 east, in the State of Oklahoma;

H. R. 13666. An act granting the consent of Congress to Muskogee County, Okla., to construct a bridge across the Arkansas River in section 18, township 12 north, range 21 east, in the State of Oklahoma;

H. R. 14100. An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 351. Joint resolution extending the provisions of an act amending section 32 of the Federal farm loan act approved July 17, 1916, to June 30, 1921.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of sundry citizens of Fairfax, Minn., praying for an investigation into the present sugar situation, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. CAPPER presented resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of citizens of Topeka, Kans., favoring the independence of the republic of Ireland, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Rotary Club of Dodge City, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for physical education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a memorial of Local Union No. 1571, Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, of Odessa, Kans., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for a tax on land values, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 1571, Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, of Odessa, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation granting the right of collective bargaining to farmers, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. SHEPPARD, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 336) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan to the Albert Sidney Johnston Camp, United Confederate Veterans, No. 1820, Fort Worth, Tex., 100 cots and blankets for the use of Confederate veterans at the reunion of said camp June 24 to 27, inclusive, 1920, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 620) thereon.

Mr. SPENCER, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 2929) for the relief of Capt. Edward T. Hartmann, United States Army, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 621) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

H. R. 2396. An act for the relief of John A. Gauley (Rept. No. 622);

H. R. 6198. An act authorizing payment of compensation to Swanbild Sims for personal injuries (Rept. No. 623); and

H. R. 9048. An act for the relief Catherina Rea, administratrix of the estate of John Rea (Rept. No. 624).

Mr. SPENCER, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 2926) for the relief of Capt. Frank B. Watson, United States Army, reported adversely thereon and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 2927) for the relief of Capt. James Ronayne, United States Army, reported adversely thereon and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 2928) for the relief of Capt. Frederick G. Lawton, United States Army, reported adversely thereon and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 4434) for the relief of contributors of the Ellen M. Stone ransom fund; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. HALE:

A bill (S. 4435) to authorize officers of the naval service to accept offices with compensation and emoluments from Governments of the Republics of South America; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 4436) to amend the act approved December 23, 1913, known as the Federal reserve act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

H. R. 13558. An act for the purpose of improving the facilities and service of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance and of further amending and modifying the war-risk insurance act as amended, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 13627. An act to amend paragraph (e) of section 7 of the act approved March 3, 1913, entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide hospital and sanatorium facilities for discharged sick and disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines," was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

THE MEAT-PACKING INDUSTRY.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending question is the motion of the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13587) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes.

Mr. KENYON. I think the motion is debatable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is a debatable motion.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, this matter arose last night and I asked that it might go over until to-day, and announced that at that time I thought we might as well make a test as to whether or not the bill (S. 3944) to create a Federal live-stock commission should be brought up. A number of Senators have spoken to me and stated that they feel such an effort at this time would not be best, because they do not want to be put in the position of voting against the consideration of the Army appropriation bill, even though they favor bringing up the packers' regulation bill. I think there is a good deal of force in that statement, and the full strength of those who are in favor of bringing up the packers' legislation and having it considered would not be fairly shown in a vote as against the consideration of an appropriation bill.

On yesterday the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], in the course of the able address of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK], said:

I am very glad to have heard the remarks of the Senator, and I think he can safely state that every Senator on this side of the Chamber would support him in a motion to take up the bill; and if there is any trouble about time, I feel equally as secure in saying that every Senator on this side of the Chamber would support a proposition on his part to fix a day for a vote upon the bill.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] in his address said:

While I have no authority for such a statement, I feel justified in the assertion that every Democratic Senator in this Chamber would be willing and ready to vote to take up this measure and consider it before adjournment.

I think with those statements and the fact that there are a number of Senators on this side of the Chamber who will vote with the Senator from Wyoming to take up Senate bill 3944, if he should make the motion, or the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] if he should make the motion, or with myself if I should make the motion, it will insure bringing up the bill before adjournment.

Under those circumstances, speaking only for myself and perhaps a few others, we will do everything we can to expedite the passage of the appropriation bills, but at any time when appropriation bills are not before the Senate, we shall attempt to bring up this particular bill.

Mr. KENDRICK. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Iowa that in order to avoid any delay of legislation that is absolutely essential, as we all know, I should like to defer any effort to call up Senate bill 3944 until the appropriation bills are out of the way, and then when a motion is made to take up the bill, I should like to have it made so as not to interfere with other bills on the calendar, but ask for unanimous consent for a vote upon the legislation, and either accept it or reject it within a given length of time. I would be perfectly willing to see the discussion of it reduced to two days, or three days, or even, if thought best, to one day.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENDRICK] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] have done more work on Senate bill 3944, which is now on the calendar, providing for the control and regulation of the packing industry, than any other two Senators or any other two men. I shall, of course, defer to their wishes with respect to making a motion to take up the bill. I was in hopes, however, that we could make it the unfinished business and then lay it aside whenever an appropriation bill or a conference report was ready for consideration.

Mr. President, I think there is a great deal of misinformation as to the provisions of the packing bill in the form it has been reported to the Senate. I assume that a vast majority of the Senators were opposed to the first draft of the bill because it provided for a licensing system. There is absolutely nothing in the bill which compels any one engaged in that industry to take out a license. It is true there is a provision in the bill for voluntary registration, but as I understand the disposition, while I do not want to make any misstatement with reference to any of the Senators, they are willing to let that provision go out.

Mr. President, what is there left in the bill that is objectionable to anyone? If I were a stockholder in a packing industry I would welcome this legislation. Without the voluntary system for a license there is nothing in the bill which will injure any of the packing concerns. I believe it would be a helpful condition for those engaged in the industry if this legislation were passed. It merely provides for the appointment of a commission, and it only gives that commission authority to make inspections and to make reports. Certainly no honest business, and I class the packers' business with honest business, ought to be opposed to a scheme of that sort.

What does the bill provide? I do not intend to take more than a few moments on it. The principal duties imposed on the agencies by the proposed legislation are:

- (a) They are prohibited from engaging in unfair, unjustly discriminatory, or deceptive practices in interstate commerce;
- (b) They are prohibited from buying or selling live stock in such manner as to apportion the supply, unreasonably affect the price, or create a monopoly;
- (c) They are prohibited from dealing in foodstuffs other than live-stock products where the result is to lessen competition;
- (d) They are prohibited from apportioning territory or purchases or arranging or agreeing to control prices;
- (e) They are prohibited from agreeing or arranging among themselves to prevent any other person from carrying on any business which competes with them;
- (f) They are required within two years after the act becomes effective to dispose of their ownership or interest in stockyards unless this time is extended for good cause.

As to the latter provision, I understood those who testified before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with regard to the bill were not opposing the idea of divorcing the stockyards from the packing industry. The stockyards were only set up for the convenience of the packers. Certainly there ought to be no objection to any item in the bill, especially if the volunteer licensing system is eliminated.

Mr. President, why should Congress refuse to at least take a vote on this legislation which has been pending before Congress for years? I shall not make any statement which will reflect on anyone engaged in the packing industry. I believe there are honest men engaged in the packing industry. There are many of them who are what we call small packers. Certainly there is no reason why the big five packers should make this tremendous fight against the legislation. The American people have been tolerant with those people.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record without reading a statement which shows the profits and the condition of all the big five packers since the beginning of their business, showing their stock, their increased capitalization, their surplus, and their dividends. I do this in order to give information to the Senate and the country. This statement was prepared by the Federal Trade Commission.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Original investment, growth in capitalization, profits, and dividends, five great packers.

	Original investment.		Capital stock outstanding.			Profits and dividends.		
	Date.	Amount.	Stock sold for cash or equivalent.	Stock dividends paid or equivalent.	Outstanding November, 1918.	Period.	Reported profits.	Dividends and drawings.
Armour & Co.....	1868	\$160,000	\$3,725,000	\$100,000,000	\$103,725,000	From 1869 to 1918, 50 years.....	\$179,270,000	\$29,866,000
Swift & Co.....	1885	300,000	100,000,000	\$50,000,000	\$150,000,000	From 1896 to 1918, 23 years.....	214,249,000	\$4,157,000
Cudahy Packing Co.....	1888	750,000	7,224,000	12,778,000	\$20,000,000	From 1888 to 1918, 31 years.....	37,665,000	13,542,000
Wilson & Co.....	1857	Unknown.	\$10,476,000	20,000,000	30,476,000	From 1894 to 1918, 25 years.....	44,390,000	6,358,000
Morris & Co.....	1853	Unknown.	Unknown.	Unknown.	3,000,000	From 1909 to 1918, 10 years.....	28,694,000	4,090,000

¹Includes original investment.
²Stock dividends were in reality somewhat more than this, in that very high dividends were declared in early years with express purpose of providing cash for purchase of new stock. Exact amount so converted can not be determined.
³Does not include cash dividend of \$25,000,000 used for purchase of new stock.
⁴Includes original corporation capitalization, which undoubtedly was largely made up of earnings of old partnership.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to make some remarks touching the same subject.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

Mr. SHERMAN. Does the Senator wish to interrupt me?

Mr. LODGE. I only want to say a word, but I will wait until the Senator has finished.

Mr. SHERMAN. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. I do not desire to debate it at all.

Mr. SHERMAN. I do not desire to debate it.

Mr. LODGE. I only wish to say that I am very glad that the Senator from North Dakota, the Senator from Wyoming, and the Senator from Iowa have taken the ground they have in regard to the supply bills. I am very anxious, and I think we all ought to be very anxious, to get the great supply bills of the Government through. There is no intention on my part, at least, to try to shut out any bill. If a majority of the Senate desire to consider the packers' bill, I am perfectly willing. I have no objection to make to it at all; but I do think that we ought to dispose of the great supply bills as rapidly as possible. I am very glad indeed that the Senators agree with me about that.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] has inserted in the Record certain alleged facts relating to the Chicago meat packers. They are but

a repetition of what has been for long time persistently thrust before the public by the Federal Trade Commission; it is but

When the Senator says that it provides for a voluntary system of registration, I remind him that a glance at the bill will show, as will be demonstrated, before the discussion ends in saying in other words, using synonymous language, practically the same thing that has been said since their report of a year or two ago, which constituted a concentrated attack upon the industry. The bill pending here is a bill reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate, of which the Senator from North Dakota is the chairman. He alleges that the bill is entirely harmless; that it contains nothing that would be at all obstructive or embarrassing to any of the different packing concerns of the country. The Senator from North Dakota may think so, but if he does he is seemingly a bland innocent. I will concede for the purposes of discussion that he sincerely thinks this is a perfectly innocent measure, but he has been led into grievous error if he has arrived at and adheres to that conclusion. After he shall have discovered the reach of this bill, thereafter it will be wholly with malice aforethought if its passage is insisted on.

The Senator has, in a general way, remarked, as did the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] yesterday, on the purposes and contents of this bill. Neither of them seems to grasp

what it will do or what its authors, the responsible gentlemen who wrote it, had in their minds it should do; because I can not think it was written altogether in the Committee on Agriculture; I think its inspiration came from some place else. This Chamber, that the voluntary registration system is an involuntary one unless it is proposed to suffer the penalties that are to be inflicted by the bill.

I do not intend, Mr. President, under the tolerance given me by the Senate, to discuss the merits of the bill, but only such matters as have been referred to this morning.

The bill, however, first confers upon the live-stock commission the same power which is conferred by the act of Congress upon the Federal Trade Commission. Going further, it confers upon them all the power of the Bureau of Markets of the Department of Agriculture. That is provided in a title of the bill preceding Title V, respecting the voluntary registration of packers and stockyards. The portion of the bill referring to voluntary registration provides for a standardized system of packing plants, and provides for collecting information. The Bureau of Markets already collects information on a great variety of subjects relative to the production of food. Under the present law both animal and vegetable foods, as well as market conditions, are covered by the Bureau of Markets. Those functions are now proposed to be taken over by the live-stock commission, so far as relates to meat products. It is then proposed, in section 5, that all who do not register shall be discriminated against; that the live-stock commission may deny to nonregistrants all of the governmental information which is collected in the bureau.

In a preceding section the live-stock commission is given the power generally to legislate on this subject—not Congress but the live-stock commission—to make such rules for the regulation of the business as it sees fit; and the bill provides penalties for the nonobservance of the rules which are made by the live-stock commission. It is a voluntary abdication of the powers of legislation and the enactment of penalties and putting them in the hands of an appointive body.

When the Senator makes an appeal that the public shall be informed upon this question, I desire to say that I shall take care in this Chamber that they are fully informed upon the iniquity which is proposed and the precedent which is sought to be created for every line of industry in the country.

The bill is not sponsored by its original creators in good faith. The Senators who present it are in good faith, but the malevolent outfit back of it and of the agitation for the last five or ten years in this country is made up of a gang of the most arrant demagogues that ever infested any community. I know them of old. They have imposed upon the Senate committee; they have imposed upon Senators; they are mere agitators and destroyers; and for them I have a supreme contempt, while highly respecting the Senators who have unwittingly lent themselves to their sinister designs. They never created anything. No industry has arisen from their efforts. No pay rolls ever follow their footsteps save that imposed on the Public Treasury.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. GRONNA. I do not want to prolong this discussion, Mr. President—

Mr. SHERMAN. I will prolong it in due season. We may just as well reach it now and let the inflammation out.

Mr. GRONNA. But I wish to say to the Senator from Illinois that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, while some of us unfortunately or fortunately are not lawyers—

Mr. SHERMAN. So much the better.

Mr. GRONNA. Have given the matter consideration, and we have used our own judgment as to the provisions of the present bill.

The Senator from Illinois refers to voluntary registration. The provision in reference to that matter is incorporated solely for the purpose of encouraging cooperative marketing. The Senator is well informed not only with reference to legislation in the United States but in foreign countries as to what cooperative marketing means; and I will say to the Senator in good faith that is all that the provision with reference to voluntary registration is intended to accomplish.

Let me say further to the Senator that the meat industry amounts in volume to more than the railroad industry, to more than the business of the railroads. We have an Interstate Commerce Commission looking after the railroads; and I say to the Senator in all seriousness and good faith that I believe it would be beneficial to the packing industry of the country—and I refer now to no particular packers—I believe it would be beneficial to the entire packing industry of the country if legislation of this kind were enacted, because under present

conditions, as the Senator knows, throughout the entire country the people are making charges of all sorts against the industry. If the proposed commission were created and good men were appointed, who, as provided in the bill, shall not be allowed to engage in any other business, but shall devote all their time to this particular business, confidence would be created in the business, and it would afford protection to the packing industry instead of doing the industry an injury.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, the people who have spread the information are Mr. Burke, Mr. Lassiter, and Mr. Kent, if I must give names, who began as live-stock producers on a ranch in Nebraska, say, and various other western points, and have branched out and created a National Live Stock Association and have spread persistently, in season and out of season, the matter referred to by the Senator from North Dakota that has aroused a certain portion of the population.

There are less than \$900,000,000 of capital and surplus actually engaged in the packing business, while there are \$20,000,000,000 engaged in the railroad business—twenty times as much and more—and the Senator, well informed as he is, knows it as well as I do. The packing business does not rank with the steel industry. There is more money invested in the poultry business than there is in the entire capital stock of the packing industry, which is attacked by this bill. Let us have a poultry commission, in order to inspect and encourage hens in due season and to mitigate the fervor of the opposite sex. [Laughter.] Where will it all end? There are enough roving commissions going around now over the country drawing salaries from the burdened Treasury.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I know the Senator does not wish to minimize the chicken or poultry industry. It is greater than the wheat industry; it ranks next to the corn crop. I will say to the Senator.

Mr. SHERMAN. The corn crop is the largest one agricultural industry in the United States, taking into account its legitimate uses since the country went dry and taking also into account what used to be wasted for bread. [Laughter.]

Mr. GRONNA. I do not want the Senator to discuss the capitalization of the industry; I want him to discuss the entire industry. I had reference to the industry as a whole.

Mr. SHERMAN. I will discuss the entire industry, if the Senator desires, at some opportune time. The difficulty is that the Senator does not distinguish at present, with the information he has from the constituency referred to, who are spreading misinformation over the country, the difference between invested capital and capital stock. The inventory values are a part of the working capital of every successful concern in the packing business in Chicago. Their inventory values fluctuate from day to day and from month to month.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, the Senator did not understand me. I said to the Senator that we ought to discuss the entire industry and not the capitalization of the industry. I referred only to the amount of business done by the stock industry; the Senator did not hear me.

Mr. SHERMAN. The Senator has in mind the volume of business?

Mr. GRONNA. The volume of business; yes.

Mr. SHERMAN. When we undertake to measure our activities and the profits by the volume of business, then the Federal Trade Commission says we are in error; that our bookkeepers are dunces and that we are thieves. That is their report. When they try to base their profits earned on the volume of business, showing 1.6 cents on every dollar's worth of turnover for every 12 months, the Federal Trade Commission repudiates the method. Under the regulations of a paternal Government limiting our profits to 2 per cent and our dividends on invested capital to 9 per cent, then we are attacked, and Mr. Hoover, for whom nobody can accuse me of having any predilection, is attacked because he fixed that rate of income or profit during the war. If the Senator from North Dakota refers to the volume of business, I am willing to discuss the question on that basis at a fit time, but the Senator will find himself involved in a lasting controversy with the Federal Trade Commission, and especially with its chairman, who in his last report takes considerable umbrage because the packers insist on estimating their profits on the volume of business and show how much they earn every 12 months on a dollar's worth of business.

The distinguished gentlemen on the Federal Trade Commission have a system of accounting that but few accountants in the civilized world ever heard of or ever practiced, and which no successful business men ever put into operation and long remain solvent. That is the kind of stuff that is scattered out to the dear American public in order to inflame them, and cause

the agitation that these gentlemen, with their ears constantly to the ground, mistake for the voice of the people.

I have seen a good many people with their ears to the ground, right up close to it, mistake the rumble. Instead of being the advancing onset of a majority, it has often turned out to be a minority after the ballots got into the box. Probably one of my political crimes is supporting for many years the direct election of Senators. I think it has converted us into a coterie of Congressmen at Large sitting in this body, and robbed the Senate of its original functions as it was designed by the fathers who framed the Constitution. Most of us always have our ears to the ground. A man who can not sometimes, on a principle of right, face an angry multitude is not fit to sit in this body. If you can not take your political life in your hands once in a while and go out on a question of governmental righteousness and instruct men who know nothing about what they are preaching to you, then you are unfit to hold a seat in this body. If I had my way about it, I would limit the legislative functions of this body as it has grown to be now. Why, under the new system of elections there are two Congressmen at Large from every State with not a Senator.

In every large State, look at the results of this agitation in every large stock-raising or food-producing center. Here is a comparative handful made up of two or three hired attorneys lending themselves to this agitation. When it comes to a question of lawyers, I never knew a case or a question, right or wrong, that could not hire two or three distinguished lawyers on either side to keep up the agitation. So they have their attorneys employed, paid for by the Government. They have gone on with their system of spreading misinformation, and some of it, unwittingly, has been inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In due season, Mr. President, if it is insisted that it be done at this session of Congress, before we separate here, whether it be a recess or an adjournment, I shall take up these matters in detail; and I will say this, with all due respect to the Federal Trade Commission: They have a very erroneous conception of the laws of their country. They have no conception of the Constitution of the country, and less respect for the courts, and less knowledge of actual business. To them the Constitution is a collection of obstacles, a thing to be denounced because it was written a long time ago, and anything that is ancient is to be condemned.

These gentlemen have produced report after report, agitation following upon agitation every year. They are here in Congress. They are not lobbyists—certainly not. They are distinguished statesmen, promoting the public welfare.

If a packer in Chicago were to run for the Senate, become a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, frame a bill, or have somebody else frame it, that would put all the stock-raising industry, the cattlemen, under the control of a commission on the pasturage, the range, the price of cattle, how they should be sold, and how they should be raised and bred, and fix the age at which every calf should be slaughtered, and destroy the production of veal, and provide that every calf when it got to be 2 years old had to be slaughtered, and a packer were to come in here and sit in the Senate in his seat and promote such legislation as that, there would be a mighty caterwaul of rage going up from these Senators that would rend the very heavens. It would even be said that they were unfit to grace a seat in this Chamber; and still there are Senators, whose names I will forbear to mention, who are here, by this identical legislation, promoting their business as cattle raisers. Why can one occupation elect those in it to Congress to promote that pursuit and be crowned with a halo of civic virtue and a packer be denounced as a private citizen for defending himself from ruin?

If a packer sat here and did what cattle raisers do in this Chamber these saints would be smitten dumb with horror.

What is the difference between a cattle raiser and a packer? I knew slightly the elder Armour. He came down from Milwaukee in earlier days. When the firm started business in Chicago in 1867 it had \$160,000 in money, and that is all Philip Armour had in the world, except his ability to do business. It has grown, but its capital stock has not multiplied as much as that of my neighbor in the corn belt who entered his land at \$1.25 an acre in his lifetime, and to-day it is worth \$460. He, too, is drawing interest on watered stock, but as long as it is the calloused-handed producer back of the plow handles everybody shouts "amen," and the Senator from North Dakota, of course, will say with me that it is thrice blessed that it is so.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SHERMAN. With great pleasure.

Mr. GRONNA. Does the Senator undertake to say that the lands he refers to in Illinois pay the same rate of dividends upon the amount he names that the packers have received in dividends upon their capital stock?

Mr. SHERMAN. No; I did not say that.

Mr. GRONNA. I think the Senator ought to discuss that subject.

Mr. SHERMAN. I will discuss it in due time.

Mr. GRONNA. Some day when we are not so anxious to adjourn I shall be very glad to discuss it with the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. SHERMAN. If the Senator wants to stay all summer, as long as I have got to stay here, he will have ample time both to hear from me and to respond. I have made up my mind that if I have to stay here through the summer I will stay, but I shall furnish such entertainment as I am able during that time. I am not a candidate for office, thank Heaven. I shall not be on the ticket, for which I again return thanks; and there is nobody so well equipped as I am to stay here through midsummer and until the black haws are ripe in the Wabash country. We will let the G. O. P. save itself. We will remain and discuss the question of answering the demands of a few vociferous cattlemen by proxy. Few of them raise cattle. Some who are in official stations are large producers of cattle. I could incidentally remark here—I will get to the market some time when we are discussing this question, Mr. President—that one of them received the highest price for cattle in the Chicago market that he ever received in his life, in this same market that he is now trying to destroy. I state this measure will destroy the live-stock markets in the principal parts of the country, those of Kansas City, Omaha, Chicago, St. Louis, and such other points in the West and Southwest as can be included in that classification.

I do not wish to cover these questions now. It is only because of the questions asked that I have been led off into this digression. I was speaking of the bill. This voluntary registration provision is framed with the deliberate purpose of making outlaws of all those that do not register and bringing upon them a Government boycott, denying them information from the Bureau of Markets, putting them upon the prohibited list, rendering them subject to the surveillance and suspicion of every sleuth bearing a Government commission that is turned out of this Capital to prey upon the legitimate industries of this country. That is what this section of the voluntary registration bill will do. It makes outlaws of all who do not register; and then, to confound the thing still worse, it undertakes to establish a standardized packing house.

Why, I would just as lief, for my part, undertake to standardize an undershirt. Everybody has his own choice on that, according to his ability and his physical condition. Standardize a packing house! Well, you will standardize the breeding of cattle, the handling of chickens, the cutting of side meat. Standardize accounts! Of course, arithmetic is arithmetic. It has been from the time the Arabs invented it. The laws are the same. They are like the laws of nature. We do not change that; but the methods of applying it in bookkeeping are infinite. They propose to establish a uniform system; and then turn back to the title preceding that. It was quite innocently, and wholly by mischance, of course, that this evidence taken by the live-stock commission should be taken under the powers of the Federal Trade Commission.

What has the Federal Trade Commission done under the exercise of those powers? I know there is a weak denial proceeding from hesitating lips when they are charged with it and brought to book. These investigations are ex parte. No opportunity is given to cross-examine witnesses.

The days of the Inquisition never saw such narrow, unjust, illegal examination of witnesses as that before the Federal Trade Commission. It is a disgrace to the name of Government—an ex parte hearing, the entire ransacking of everybody's desk, his books, papers, and correspondence. Letters running back for 25 years were sought to be taken, without a search warrant describing them, by breaking into the office, by opening the vaults, by prying up the lids of roll-top desks and taking away what they pleased; and it was only halted by an application to the Federal courts that stopped them and delivered an opinion that this provision of the bill was wholly beyond the Constitution. Then Mr. Colver turned around and anathematized the Constitution as an ancient, antique document that is designed as a sheltering place of rogues. It is such a pass that affairs in this country have reached.

Why, the packers were indicted; Mr. Armour was indicted in Chicago about 1905 or 1906. My distinguished friend and very able lawyer from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], who is absent, was a

Government attorney in that prosecution. A jury was had—12 good and lawful men, the peers of the defendants. Who were they—bankers, millionaires, stockbrokers, members of bond houses, and so forth? No; they were the same kind of constituents that these gentlemen now say are in an astonishing uproar urging them into this legislation. They were farmers, nearly all of them. One of them I served with in the legislature was an actual farmer. He was a successful farmer, stock raiser, cattleman, hog producer, member of the State board of agriculture, and was at every State agricultural fair and exhibit there was in Illinois. He was, with others like him, on the jury, and they lived within the destructive jaws of the market arrangements that are anathematized by these reports of the Federal Trade Commission. They heard all the evidence and acquitted the packers—a jury of farmers did.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

Mr. SHERMAN. Just a moment. Six years ago I asked the promoters of this legislation if they did not agree with me, and they said they had no explanation to make of the vagaries of juries. A sense of justice, the administration of law, the finding of the defendant not guilty by a jury of his peers, is a vagary of a jury. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator from Illinois is always fair, and I know he wants to be fair in this matter. I hope he will not make it appear that the members of the committee have drawn the bill based upon anything other than what has absolutely been done by some commission. The Senator, of course, knows that Mr. Armour, Mr. Swift, and a great many of those prominent men were before our committee for a number of days, and we had testimony from their own lips in reference to many of these matters. I do not think we disagree as much as the Senator imagines on some of the provisions of the bill.

The Senator referred to the matter of bookkeeping. To show the Senator that we are not trying to discriminate, I will state that we are trying to standardize the bookkeeping of the farmers, and there is a provision in the last Agricultural appropriation bill appropriating a small amount of money, in the office of Farm Management and Farm Economics, to have the farmers keep books, to standardize the bookkeeping of the farmers. I simply mention it to show that we are not only legislating against the packers; we are acting in the interest of the farmers in trying to standardize their business.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois permit me to ask a question of the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Surely the Senator did not mean to say that there was a provision in the Agricultural bill to compel farmers to keep books?

Mr. GRONNA. No.

Mr. SHERMAN. It would not be compulsory.

Mr. GRONNA. There is nothing compulsory about it. It is just as compulsory as any provision in this bill.

Mr. SHERMAN. The farmer can absorb the information or can reject it with scorn, as he sees fit. That is correct, is it not? This bill forces packers to accept Government bookkeeping. I will just put that alongside of the provision for cottage cheese, and for smoking out rats in a barn when you do not want to burn the barn down to get the rats, and for a host of noxious, predatory, herbaceous, and carnivorous insects of various kinds which have been discovered by salaried job holders to be very hurtful to the farmer. If there has been any scheme presented in this Chamber, if there has been some unholy, hoary relic of prejudice generated by these quick-spawned statesmen on commissions and bureaus going about over the country, if there is some indefensible raid upon the Treasury, some fresh burden to be saddled upon the taxpayer, some fresh way of evading constitutional government, of assaulting legitimate business under the name of reform—if it has not been produced here and been stalked out in this Chamber in the name of something the farmer needed, I have not yet the memory to recall it, and my memory is fairly good.

Everything for the farmer! If this Government and the Capitol would leave the farmer alone, he would get along pretty well.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, but in the face of all that discrimination in favor of the farmer, the Senator knows that a large percentage are leaving the farms. It is not so in the packing business.

Mr. SHERMAN. The Senator does not see anything but the successful packer. I can call the roll of the packing companies, and it is like the roll of those who succeed in mines out in the Rockies. We hear of the Strattons about Colorado Springs, and we hear of successful men up and down the range all the

way from the Mexican border to Canada, but you do not hear of the bankrupt ones. I do, and anybody who has been about the courts for 40 years knows something about it. You never hear of the man who never strikes a good vein, but you hear of the successful ones, and where there is a successful packer the whole beach of modern business for the last 30 years is strewn with stranded packing concerns, reaching all the way from San Francisco, over the range, through Omaha and Lincoln, back to Council Bluffs and Sioux City. I can call the roll, and I can get more of them.

The packers are like other people—they do business upon correct principles or they fail. Men are not leaving farms because of packers. It is the faulty standards of life adopted by a generation who prefer pleasure to profit.

As to these matters which are for the benefit of the farmer, 99 out of 100 of them are a detriment. The farmer's name is used in vain, blasphemously and sacrilegiously, by somebody who has an ax to grind for his own selfish purposes.

I have never been deceived about these self-styled farmers' associations, with offices in Chicago and in the National Capital, threatening you daily with the combined destructive force of all the farmers in the country if you do not answer their demands and legislate more money out of the Treasury to keep them alive. I have heard that for a long time, and I never have been frightened by any of these self-created farmers' associations yet. I know what the real farmer is and what the real association is. I never have taken any orders from these gentlemen with soft hands and still softer heads, sitting around the city telling my farmer constituents what to do; and yet they are all found joining in the hue and cry for this bill.

It was a mere misadventure, of course, that when courts were to be invoked—and it is the only time the Federal Trade Commission ever conceded that there was a court in this country that had any jurisdiction over anything they got after—they dodged the trial courts. There is no jury, there are none of the general powers of the equity side of the court, none of the ordinary jurisdiction, either of common law or chancery, found in the court where they go. They have gone to a court of appeals. Of course, there was a sort of a weak, half-hearted admission yesterday that there would be no objection to that being amended by the individual Senators making the statement, but it is very evident that the court of appeals was sought out because it is not a trial court. I know the Senator from North Dakota has not measured the drift of this bill, and the matter I now call his attention to I shall go into at some length later when it is properly before the Senate, and when I am not here merely talking by the good nature of the Senate.

Here is a provision as to what the commission shall do after it has heard the evidence—as it pleases. It is a law unto itself; it makes no rule it does not want to make; it follows no rule governing the admission or exclusion of testimony. Colver never heard of Greenleaf or Wigmore in his life. He would not know what either of them was. He would not know whether he was a fisherman or a poultryman. But with an entire happy disregard of the laws of evidence they hear a complaint, either on behalf of some individual or on their own motion. They have original jurisdiction to try suits before themselves. They are like the old justice of the peace in the New England township in the early history of my State. He was always a collecting agent, and he started suits himself before his own court, and of course judgment was always rendered for the plaintiff. The mere fact that a defendant was sued was enough to put him at fault, and a finding was had accordingly. Here they can initiate suits themselves before their own body and hear them, and that is all the evidence in the case. All you can do, if you offer evidence and it is not admitted, is to make a tender of what you expect to prove and then go to the circuit court of appeals for the district in which the hearing is had and endeavor to have the scope of the evidence enlarged. That is the only way; and then there comes in a very singular provision, which was written in not by a layman—because a layman would never struggle into such an unhappy state of affairs—but by some lawyer who has spent his time trying to get away from the Constitution. I know lawyers whose entire profession is trying to avoid the Constitution. It is not merely those who are advisers of corporations, either. It is those who are baiting corporations, who are just as bad. I know others who on the platform spend the most of their time denouncing the Constitution.

If there is anything that has ever shown the wisdom of the men who made it in Philadelphia, it is the strain it has been under in the last five or six years, especially since the war broke out and those vast powers were given to the Executive. The fact that it has survived and that there is in the hearts

of men yet a respect and a reverence for constitutional government is the best recommendation of the work of the fathers in Philadelphia. It was not made there. It is a thousand years old.

Still these gentlemen on the Trade Commission and their attorneys are trying to avoid some of the most salutary provisions found in American constitutional government.

What does this mean? The court of appeals "may affirm or set aside the order of the commission or may direct the commission to modify its order. No such order of the commission shall be modified or set aside by the circuit court of appeals unless it is shown by the packer or operator that the order is unsupported by evidence;" not unsupported by the evidence in the case, but unsupported by ex parte evidence, just taking it on one side. If you consider the evidence and, as in the case of a grand jury in returning an indictment, if you can find anything to support it, the vote will be to sustain the findings of the live-stock commission. That is why it was drawn in that way. Senators probably do not perceive the drift of it; but the attorneys whose eyes scanned the sections I am referring to knew precisely what they were undertaking to do. They proposed to avoid not only the trial courts but to have an ex parte hearing in the court of appeals, with the order to be sustained unless it is unsupported by evidence. If it is supported by evidence on one side of the contention, it is to be sustained, and that is the purpose of that section.

Mr. President, I do not wish to let go unchallenged some of the matters which were put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this morning. I am very loath to mention it without going into it at some length, but I do not wish to impose upon the Senate for that purpose. These statements made by the Federal Trade Commission of colossal dividends, of great stock dividends distributed as paid-up stock to stockholders, have been sent out as evidence of the packers being the cause of the high price of meat to the consumer; that when it reaches your table and mine they are responsible for round steak at 46 cents, for porterhouse at 69 cents, for pork at the various prices at which it has sold.

Mr. President, let me take one specific statement in the Federal Trade Commission's report that Armour & Co. declared a stock dividend of 400 per cent, about 1900 I think it was. I am trusting now entirely to my memory. I will correct it if necessary when I go into it at some further hearing and produce the Federal Trade Commission's report on the subject. As a matter of fact, there was not a dollar to speak of in the treasury when the stock dividend was declared. The Armour Co. up to that time had been entirely a family corporation. Philip Armour meanwhile had died, after some years of successful effort in the business and seeing it grow from the \$160,000 with which he started. The branch house in Chicago, a branch house of Plankinton & Armour in Milwaukee, grew to be the principal concern. They did not distribute the profits of the business. It was a partnership of individuals. The dominant spirit in the Chicago packing house, now known as Armour & Co., in the earlier days was Philip Armour.

There were small dividends declared after 1900. It was incorporated in 1900. In the 14 years preceding the war down to 1914, of all the earnings of the business of Armour & Co. nearly 87 per cent were retained of the net earnings and the balance was distributed in dividends. I do not mean 87 per cent on the capital stock. I am speaking now of dividends; I am speaking of total dividends, that for that period of time, from 1900 down to 1914, 87 per cent of all dividends earned were kept in the treasury in the form of buildings, brick and mortar, of machinery, physical equipment, or inventoried perishable merchandise in some form, either canned, pickled, smoked, or preserved meats, or fresh meats in transit to the market. Ordinarily fresh meats can not be kept over seven days, even with modern methods of chilling.

The result was they had accumulated a surplus, and they kept it and reinvested it in the business instead of issuing bonds or borrowing at the bank. From 1868 up to 1900, during the period of all those years, they had pursued the same policy before incorporation. They paid out only a small part in dividends. Up to 1900 it was purely an affair of the Armour family.

Between 1914 and 1917—that is, from the year when the war began up to the time we entered the war in 1917—they kept 88 per cent of their earnings either in buildings, in merchandise, inventory value, or in some kind of property necessary to the packing business, and the other, less than 12 per cent, 11 and a fraction per cent, they distributed in dividends through the three years. From 1917 up to 1919 they kept 91 per cent in their treasury.

When they incorporated in 1900 is the time about which our friends, the Federal Trade Commission, made complaint that there was a stock dividend of 400 per cent. As a matter of fact, I wish the public to know that this stock dividend represented the savings of 50 years in the Armour family. In 1900 it was incorporated. Of course, my dear friends, the Federal Trade Commission, and some of these professional agitators who have a steer some place and a cow some place else, and call themselves cattlemen, could not refrain from taking the last cent of dividend and the last dollar out of any corporate treasury that they had anything to do with or had any stock in. They would be clamoring for dividends. They can not understand how anyone would ever have any thrift, and when they find anybody that wishes to keep the affair solvent they want to penalize it. That is what they are trying to do in this bill, and in their misleading and mischievous reports that have gone out to the public about great stock dividends.

In private conversation I have had some complaint made about Libby, McNeill & Libby, one of the small packers of Chicago, who put up a great deal in the way of food lines and send them out—apple butter, jams, jellies, preserves, dried and evaporated fruits, and so forth—as well as meat products. It is an old concern that has not heretofore been very much in the public eye. A majority of the stock was for a time owned by the Swifts. It was a subsidiary or affiliated company with Swift & Co. It has been segregated. Recently it declared a stock dividend about which considerable vicious criticism occurred in certain magazines and newspapers. The stock dividend of \$12,800,000 does not exist. Six million four hundred thousand dollars of it is actual cash stock given to the old stockholders with the option of paying for it in cash one hundred cents on the dollar. They are given \$6,400,000, or a little less, in paid-up stock, and that a little cash in the treasury, because there is no cash in the treasury except a mere working balance. The actual property represented by the paid-up stock of the smaller men, by the \$6,400,000, is the inventoried value of merchandise on hand, together with additions to the plant of buildings, machinery, equipment, and the like, required in the conduct of their business, with stock offered employees. Therefore these inventory values are a large accumulation of past years and these inventory values depend upon the rise and fall of the market.

They accumulated large stocks during war times and have not yet disposed of them. They are putting them on the market and the market is absorbing them as rapidly as possible, but their warehouses are filled yet with large stocks. They must go on and fill in, for the market as it presents itself, such live stock, and such fruits, before the decree was entered inhibiting them from selling other than meat foods; they must go on and fill in, so they helped to buy, on the Chicago market or elsewhere, their share of live stock as they can get it under their bids.

The inventoried value of this property depends upon the rise and fall of the market whether there is a stock dividend sufficiently backed by values to pay it up.

If Senators have followed the course of live-stock markets and the sale of meats at the jobbers' prices, they will readily appreciate the fact that this inventory value of a company is the most precarious thing in the world. If falling prices come, these values will drop, and instead of having paid-up stock with value behind it, you will have paid up only in part, except for such losses as occur, only the value of your property equal to that shrunken valuation that comes from the market.

These things the public do not know. These things Senators seem not to know. Much less does the Agricultural Committee seem to have given due weight to them in the vast clamor, that came before the meetings of that committee, of those gentlemen who were interested in promoting this legislation from a purely private point of view.

These war stocks depend upon the market. The Federal Trade Commission, among other things, in this matter of bookkeeping which they propose to compel them to do, compels every packer to keep books in a certain way, and upon their methods of taking their inventory values at actual cost and not upon market value. There is not a large corporation in the United States whose operations run up into anything like one-tenth of the volume of the five packers who conduct their bookkeeping on that basis. The entire method of bookkeeping of the successful business world in the United States is diametrically opposite to that proposed by the Federal Trade Commission.

If the cost price is taken, one can see in a moment why the Federal Trade Commission wishes it. The meat animal on the hoof is turned into meat by the packer. It has to be taken at

cost. The actual cost of the animal, taking the per cent of the weight which can be turned into edible products, making due allowance for inedible products and by-products, charging them against the finished products of the animal all around, is to be the cost, including everything from hide and horns to the glue and bones and to the small hair cut out of the ear of the steer and used in making paint brushes for artists and for other fine work where line tracing is required.

They insist that that be taken at cost and that all that shall constitute the inventory value. When they have it in their warehouses, on their shelves, in transit, or at their branch houses in the United States there is one way to consider taking an inventory value, say, on the 1st day of January, 1920, and that is at the quotable market prices found in the principal markets of the United States at that time. There is no other way for a successful concern to inventory its merchandise. That is one of the methods sought to be corrected by this bill, and it is the ground of great complaint.

I know why the Federal Trade Commission wish that basis changed. If they take actual cost, then if the earnings happen to be high it will show on that low cost a much larger per cent of earnings to gross, correspondingly, and a much larger complaint by the Federal Trade Commission. If it be taken at actual market values in selling the product on the market, they go up and down; they are high at some periods; and if on the 1st day of January the market price of these products is a given figure, then in estimating the profits, either by volume of business or on the net worth of the capital and surplus, it shows a correspondingly smaller per cent of dividends if it be taken at market price, and that is the milk in the coconut of my dear friends of the Federal Trade Commission. They do not want to take the ordinary way in which all the business concerns of the country are conducting their business and estimate their dividends on whether they are making or losing money.

I wish the public to know this alongside of the misleading reports that have gone out from the Federal Trade Commission. To-day the packers are loaded up with accumulated war stocks; the market is falling. If they had not had the foresight to prepare for the bad years and for the readjustments that would come, the whole live-stock market of the United States would be paralyzed in 30 days. It is only the long habit of foresight and self-restraint and leaving earnings in the treasury and not distributing any dividends, never to be recalled, that has made it possible for the four or five large packers of the country now to approach the period of readjustment with absolutely no fear of disturbing the live-stock market.

There are but four packers in Chicago who buy on that market. Cudahy does not buy in the Chicago market. For many years, for more than 20 years, Michael Cudahy was an employee of the elder Armour, and finally bought a small packing plant in Omaha and developed it and has now become one of the leading packers.

But these gentlemen prepared themselves for this slump in value. Inevitably it is so.

"Well," some one says, "it costs me just as much in my kitchen for meat products as it did before there was a selling price." I have heard that a number of times. Last August the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia conducted an investigation. I know the price at which refrigerated meats in their cars were delivered last week and this morning in the District of Columbia to the local meat-market men. Let me say for the benefit of that distinguished gentry that they are making from 60 to 140 per cent on every pound of meat that they get out of a refrigerator car from the big packers, and no one says a word.

A Senator told me a few days ago that some Member of Congress—I do not know of which body—went into a shoe shop here to buy a pair of shoes. They asked him \$20 for the pair he wanted. That is here in Washington. It is a shop directly east of Woodward & Lothrop's department store. I will identify it that much so that it can be located without a search warrant. He did not buy them, but he wrote to the manufacturer of the shoes and wanted to know what they were jobbed for to this dealer. They were jobbed to this distinguished retail merchant, this great light of the commercial world in Washington, at \$8.

The packers made 1.6 per cent on their entire volume of business, which my friend from North Dakota says he will accept as the basis of calculation. I know he is a very sensible and a very fair man and will conduct the discussion in that way. In a year when by the Food Administration, under the war powers of the President, the profits were limited to 9 per cent in the edible products of the animal, they made 5 and a little less than six-tenths per cent on their net worth, including capital and surplus. They handle green hides, which eventually go into shoes, and they are handling them on a very narrow margin. I will at some time go into the leather business and show

how the packers became interested in tanyards; but the leather that made the pair of shoes to which I have referred returned to the packer an exceedingly small per cent of profit on the investment. The retail dealer in Washington, however, wants 250 per cent on the retail price to the man who wears the shoes.

There is nobody apparently who wants the retail dealer put under the Federal Trade Commission or under a boot and shoe commission; nobody wants to hang him to a lamp-post because of the price at which he is retailing footgear. The truth is that some of the most annoying, the most heartless, profiteering in this country is by the retail dealers.

Everybody knows why prices are cut now and why a general reduction has swept from Washington clear to the Pacific coast. It shows me I was right some years ago when I voted against the Federal reserve bank act. The Federal reserve banks have ordered all the member banks to curtail credits. In plain English, that means to the borrower from the bank, "come in and pay up; we can not carry you any longer; we will forfeit your collateral or we will sue you or do something else"; and the profiteering merchant, who has been loaded up with merchandise and has had his shelves groaning with these 250 per cent profit goods, is shoving them out on the market and trying now to attract the wary consumer to purchase, but the wary consumer is going back to his old shoes which he has had cobbled over; he is not buying any tailor-made or ready-made suits, but is hauling out of the closet his old ones, taking a club and beating the moths out of them, having them cleaned, and putting them on. It added to my tie of friendship for the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] when he said a day or two ago that he was wearing patched clothes. I expect to do the same thing, for the next suit I get out, I think, will need it. The power to control credits now lies in the hands of the Federal reserve bank.

All of these causes combined have stopped purchasing. Then, on top of that, the banks are curtailing credits. The merchant has to sell to get money to pay up his loans, and, of course, is now offering his wares at a 25 per cent reduction and in some places at a reduction of 40 per cent. It is a deathbed repentance, but it is better than none, and I presume that some souls have gone to immortal glory on that kind of a bill of health. Let them go. I should, however, like to see some of these distinguished gentlemen like Mr. Burke, Mr. Lassitter, Mr. Kent, and others who are groaning over the fate of the ultimate consumer and his woes—I should like to see them get after some of the real offenders; not the men who are making 5.6 per cent on the net worth of the capital invested in the business and 1.6 per cent on their volume of business, but those who are taking all the way from 40 to 140 or 250 per cent in the footgear business and see what they do with them.

Once in a while an isolated cry goes up here to the effect that the situation I have described ought to be attended to, and we all with one accord say, "Yes; yes"; and we breathe privately our maledictions upon the profiteer in the retail business, and then we go directly off and forget all about it. But the agitation against the packers, like the poor, we always have with us, and I suppose from now until corn-shucking time out West every day that the Senate is in session some distinguished statesman who hungers for a headline in the press will rise and make a speech about the packers. That is to be expected. I do not know whether it hurts the packers or not, because, probably, they have got to survive at last under the constitutional rights of person and property; but it creates some trouble, and when they get through, and all of this elaborate machinery is imposed upon the business, in all human probability the cost of meat will go up like everything else.

We have now under Government control, administered by means of rather elaborate machinery, street cars in the city of Washington; and the fare has been increased from six tickets for a quarter very recently up to four tickets for 30 cents now. About the same proportion will hold good as to meat products when the proposed live-stock commission is authorized to regulate the packers' business.

I shall conclude in a moment, and do not intend at this time to make any extended comment upon this matter; but later I expect to take it up and to trace the history of the development of the packing industry and their methods of doing business, and expose some of what I believe to be manifest errors of the Trade Commission in what they have reported at divers times about the packing business.

About a year ago next July I made some remarks about the chairman of the board, Mr. Colver. He vociferously traveled about over the United States a good deal, inviting various people to debate with him. He invited the packers to debate; but they are business men, and not verbal disturbers, and, as if I were in that class, he invited me to debate with him. Well, when I

have nothing to do but go out and debate with Brother Colver, I trust that I shall be taken to an asylum for the feeble-minded. He receives attention only when he is found spreading official inaccuracies. I shall pay my respects to him later. He has been thirsting for information which I have, and I will give it to him in due season—when the packing bill comes up here and requires discussion.

But before I conclude I wish to say a few words further. The Senator from North Dakota said that there were very extended hearings before the committee. There were packers large and small. I think there are about 200 of them collected now in the American Institute of Meat Packers. Of course, that is a very iniquitous organization, but they are there and seem to be getting along very happily, the big ones and the little ones. A great many of them appeared before the committee and gave evidence; and I challenge the committee or the trade commission to produce to exceed two small packers—and I do not know whether there were any—who appeared before the committee and complained of the competition and the method of doing business they met at the hands of the big packers. They stated uniformly that they were making money, that they were getting along, and that they had no complaint to make, about the packers. In the very report of the Federal Trade Commission, I wish to remind the Senator from North Dakota, so that it may go along with what he has put in the RECORD, of the fact that the 60 small packers are admitted to be making as large dividends, or larger, than the five big packers. Now, what complaint is there about it? The only complaint is because they have grown large as the result of successful business management.

I have given expression, Mr. President, to these few cursory remarks only following what was offered by the Senator from North Dakota, and as a partial explanation of what he incorporated in the RECORD. I had not expected to take the question up to-day, but if this bill is to come up each morning until we merge into the December session I will have time, I trust, to go somewhat into the bill and analyze it, together with the gentlemen who originally proposed it—not in the committee, but elsewhere—who, I think, are well worthy of some analysis and attention. When that time shall arrive, I intend to take up the packing business and this bill at some length. This morning I forbear. I thank the Senate for their kindness in granting me the time I have consumed.

ARMY APPROPRIATIONS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New York that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Army appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 13587) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I understand it is the intention of another Senator to suggest the absence of a quorum in a moment, but before that is done I desire to make a request for unanimous consent for the printing in the RECORD of a letter which I have addressed to Mr. Samuel Gompers in reply to a letter which I received from him two days ago, and which was placed in the RECORD yesterday by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA].

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator read the letter? It is not very long, and I should like to have him read it or to have the Secretary read it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Very well; I will ask that the Secretary read the letter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Assistant Secretary proceeded to read the letter.

Mr. SMOOT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Reading Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Beckham	Henderson	New	Spencer
Borah	Jones, N. Mex.	Norris	Stanley
Brandege	Jones, Wash.	Nugent	Sterling
Capper	Kellogg	Overman	Trammell
Curtis	Kendrick	Page	Underwood
Dial	Keyes	Sheppard	Wadsworth
Dillingham	Lenroot	Sherman	Walsh, Mass.
Edge	McCumber	Simmons	Walsh, Mont.
Fernald	McKellar	Smith, Ariz.	Warren
Gay	McLean	Smith, Ga.	
Glass	McNary	Smith, Md.	
Hale	Nelson	Smoot	

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN], the Senator

from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] are absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-five Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the names of absent Senators.

The Reading Clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. TOWNSEND answered to his name when called.

Mr. KNOX, Mr. POMERENE, Mr. SWANSON, Mr. McCORMICK, Mr. FALL, Mr. WATSON, Mr. FRANCE, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HARDING, Mr. GRONNA, Mr. KING, Mr. LODGE, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. HITCHCOCK, Mr. HARRISON, Mr. CULBERSON, and Mr. ROBINSON entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-four Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The Secretary will continue the reading of the letter presented by the Senator from New York.

The Assistant Secretary resumed and concluded the reading of the letter, which is as follows:

MAY 22, 1920.

SAMUEL GOMPERS, Esq.,

President American Federation of Labor,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am in receipt of your letter of May 19 regarding that feature of pending Army reorganization legislation which provides for the immediate application of the selective draft in the event of a national emergency, declared by the Congress and proclaimed by the President. I have read your criticisms of these provisions with great care and am convinced that they are based upon a misconception of the meaning and purpose of the language employed.

The first criticism has to do with the phrase "national emergency," and you contend that the use of that phrase would permit the drafting of citizens into the service of the Federal Government in peace as well as in war, and that it would result in the "conscription of workers in industry" and in subjecting them to "involuntary servitude." Needless to say, nothing of the sort is intended. The term "emergency" was employed by the Senate committee as descriptive of a state of war of the first magnitude, constituting a national emergency. The same term was used in several of the war-time enactments as descriptive of the war in which we were then engaged. The Senate committee had no other thought in mind than that the term "national emergency" would be taken to mean a state of war involving grave danger. And it should not be forgotten that whatever the crisis confronting the country it must first be declared a national emergency by the Congress, composed of Representatives of the people, and proclaimed by the President.

At the time of the passage of the bill in the Senate it did not occur to anyone that the expression "national emergency" would be subject to doubt as to its meaning. Three or four weeks ago some doubt was expressed upon this point, and, as a result, the managers on the part of the Senate, who are now sitting in conference with the managers of the House, suggested that the expression "national emergency" be replaced by the words "state of war constituting a national emergency." It is the intention of the Senate managers to continue to urge such an amendment, in order that there may be no doubt of the intention of the Congress; and, likewise, an amendment providing that the Congress may place a limitation upon the numbers to be drafted.

Your next criticism has to do with the provision of the legislation which, in section 70, places in a deferred class those "who are needed in occupations of importance in the maintenance of the national interest during the emergency, so long as they regularly and in good faith continue in such occupations." You construe this provision to mean that the persons referred to may be drafted into industry under penalties of military law. The wording of the whole section shows very clearly that instead of drafting these persons into industry under military law, they are to be placed in a deferred class and to that extent made exempt from being drafted into the military service. This provision is in effect merely a repetition of the corresponding provision of the selective-draft law and its accompanying regulations as they stood during the war with Germany. There is no new principle involved.

In your next criticism of the bill you seek to connect the provision which I have explained above with the provisions of article 28 of chapter 2 of the bill, which revises the Articles of War. You quote the following language of that chapter:

Any person subject to military law who quits his organization or place of duty with the intent to avoid hazardous duty or shirk important service shall be deemed a deserter.

And you contend that this provision could be used to punish as a deserter, under military law, a worker who saw fit to leave the occupation in which he was engaged and for engag-

ing in which he had received deferred classification. It is apparent that you have not read article 2 of chapter 2 of this bill. In that article you will find a definition of the term "persons subject to military law." This definition is exceedingly clear in that it includes only officers and soldiers of the Regular Army, volunteers, persons called, drafted, or ordered into the military service, cadets, officers, and soldiers of the Marine Corps under certain conditions, and camp retainers and other persons accompanying or serving with the armies of the United States. In other words, only members of the military service and persons accompanying the Army can fall under the penalties prescribed in article 28 of chapter 2, to which you refer. It is utterly impossible for this penalty to apply to the workers in industry as you suggest.

I think I ought to tell you the purpose which the Senate committee had in mind when it framed and reported this legislation to the Senate. We thought it was very generally conceded that the selective-draft law had operated with marked success during the war; that, as its provisions were put into effect, they were received with an ever-increasing degree of approval by the people; that under its provisions the burden of the great effort was distributed fairly and scientifically; that without such an equal and democratic distribution of the burden it would have been impossible for the United States to have achieved such a glorious result in such a short space of time. The committee felt that were the Nation ever compelled to meet a similar crisis in the future, the public would demand and the Congress would enact a selective-draft law as the first weapon of defense. It is true that the Congress might enact such a law after the declaration of war, as was done six weeks after the declaration of a state of war with Germany, but the delay involved might very well be exceedingly dangerous. Furthermore, the placing of such a law upon the statute books in time of peace, ready for operation when Congress gives its consent, makes it possible for the Government to prepare plans in advance to meet any crisis—plans involving not only the mobilization of our armies but also the coordination of all those activities which experience shows are so necessary in the successful conduct of a great war. With such plans ready at hand, the Government could act with great speed the instant the Congress authorized the setting in motion of the machinery.

Then, too, the Committee believed that the enactment of such a provision would serve as a strong deterrent to any nation or group of nations contemplating an attack upon the United States. If the world understands that it is the declared policy of the United States to employ its full strength in men and resources the instant it is attacked, the prospect of such an attack is exceedingly remote.

I have written you at considerable length because this is a subject which should be considered by every citizen upon its merits, without misconception or misunderstanding of the motives behind it.

Very sincerely yours,

J. W. WADSWORTH, Jr.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I ask that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with and that we proceed to the reading of the bill for action on the committee amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and the bill will be read for action on the committee amendments.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I have been away. Is this the bill to which the letter just read refers?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I thought we had already acted on that bill and that it was in conference.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is true, Mr. President. I will say to the Senator from Georgia that the letter which has just been read is a reply to a letter written by Mr. Samuel Gompers to me, which letter was placed in the RECORD yesterday by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA].

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. And it has really no reference to the matter we have before the Senate?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Nothing at all.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That bill is still in conference?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. And there is no conference report before us?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Not as yet.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I thank you.

The Assistant Secretary proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs was, under the head of "Secretary of War," subhead "Contingencies of the Army," on page 2, line 16, after the word "posts," to strike out "\$150,000" and insert "\$400,000"; in line 17, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$100,000" and insert "\$350,000"; and, in line 21, after the word "claims," to

insert "Provided further, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized, in his discretion, to sell to any State or foreign Government with which the United States is at peace, upon such terms as he may deem expedient, any matériel, supplies, or equipment pertaining to the Military Establishment as or may hereafter be found to be surplus, which is not needed for military purposes and for which there is no adequate domestic market," so as to make the clause read:

For all contingent expenses of the Army not otherwise provided for and embracing all branches of the military service, including the office of the Chief of Staff; for all emergencies and extraordinary expenses, including the employment of translators and exclusive of all other personal services in the War Department or any of its subordinate bureaus or offices at Washington, D. C., or in the Army at large, but impossible to be anticipated or classified; to be expended on the approval and authority of the Secretary of War, and for such purposes as he may deem proper, including the payment of a per diem allowance not to exceed \$4, in lieu of subsistence, to employees of the War Department traveling on official business outside of the District of Columbia and away from their designated posts, \$400,000; *Provided*, That not to exceed \$350,000 of the money herein appropriated shall be expended for the payment of salaries of civilian employees connected with the sale of war supplies and the adjustment of war contracts and claims: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized, in his discretion, to sell to any State or foreign Government with which the United States is at peace, upon such terms as he may deem expedient, any matériel, supplies, or equipment pertaining to the Military Establishment as or may hereafter be found to be surplus, which is not needed for military purposes and for which there is no adequate domestic market: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated or made available under this act shall be used for the payment of any salary in excess of \$12,000 per annum to any civilian employee in the War Department.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 8, to strike out the headline "Office of the Chief of Staff."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head "Contingencies, Military Intelligence Division," subhead "Office of Chief of Staff," on page 4, line 12, after the word "War," to strike out "\$100,000" and insert "\$400,000," so as to make the clause read:

For contingent expenses of the Military Intelligence Division, General Staff Corps, including the purchase of law books, professional books of reference; subscription to newspapers and periodicals; drafting and messenger service; and of the military attachés at the United States embassies and legations abroad; the cost of special instruction at home and abroad, and in maintenance of students and attachés; and for such other purposes as the Secretary of War may deem proper; to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War, \$400,000: *Provided*, That section 3648, Revised Statutes, shall not apply to subscription for foreign and professional newspapers and periodicals to be paid for from this appropriation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under subhead "Expenses, military observers abroad," on page 4, line 19, after the word "States," to strike out "at war," so as to make the clause read:

For the actual and necessary expenses of officers of the Army on duty abroad for the purpose of observing operations of armies of foreign States, to be paid upon certificates of the Secretary of War that the expenditures were necessary for obtaining military information, \$25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under subhead "United States service schools," on page 5, line 20, after the words "Secretary of War," to strike out "\$75,000" and insert "\$100,000," so as to make the clause read:

To provide means for the theoretical and practical instruction at the Army service schools (including the General Staff School, the School of the Line, and the Signal Corps School at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., the Army Field Service School and Correspondence School for Medical Officers, at Washington, D. C., the Cavalry School at Fort Riley, Kans., the Field Artillery Schools at Fort Sill, Okla., and at Camp Zachary Taylor or Camp Knox, Ky., and for the Infantry School at Camp Benning, Ga.) by the purchase of textbooks, books of reference, scientific and professional papers, the purchase of modern instruments and material for the theoretical and practical instruction, employment of temporary, technical, or special services, and for all absolutely necessary expenses, to be allotted in such proportion as may, in the opinion of the Secretary of War, be for the best interests of the military service. Not exceeding \$400 per month may be used for the payment of \$100 per month each to a translator at the Army Service Schools, Fort Leavenworth, Kans., Field Artillery School, Fort Sill, Okla., the Infantry School, Camp Benning, Ga., and the Cavalry School, Fort Riley, Kans., to be appointed by the commandants of the schools named, with the approval of the Secretary of War, \$100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "The Adjutant General's Department," subhead "Completion and preservation of the selective-service records and the preparation of statements of service for adjutants general of States," on page 7, line 14, after the word "records," to insert "and for the employment of clerical help required to furnish to the adjutants general of the several States statements of service of all persons from those States who entered the military service during the war with Germany, is hereby reappropriated and made available for the fiscal year 1921, for all expenses, including the employment of clerical and other help in the office of The Adjutant General of the Army, necessary for the completion and

preservation of the selective-service records and the completion of the work of furnishing statements of service to adjutants general of States: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be disbursed by such officer as may be designated by the Secretary of War for the purpose," so as to make the clause read:

The unexpended balance of the \$3,500,000, reappropriated in the Army appropriation act for the fiscal year 1920, approved July 11, 1919, for the completion, preservation, and transportation of the records pertaining to the draft under the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States," approved May 18, 1917, including the employment of the necessary clerical and other help for duty in the office of The Adjutant General of the Army in connection with the arrangement, operation, and maintenance of the files of those records, and for the employment of clerical help required to furnish to the adjutants general of the several States statements of service of all persons from those States who entered the military service during the war with Germany, is hereby reappropriated and made available for the fiscal year 1921, for all expenses, including the employment of clerical and other help in the office of The Adjutant General of the Army, necessary for the completion and preservation of the selective-service records and the completion of the work of furnishing statements of service to adjutants general of States: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be disbursed by such officer as may be designated by the Secretary of War for the purpose.

Mr. SMOOT. I would like to ask the Senator having the bill in charge if he knows the amount of money that is available for the fiscal year 1921?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Out of what fund?

Mr. SMOOT. This amendment provides that "for the employment of clerical help required to furnish to the adjutants general of the several States statements of service of all persons in those States who entered the military service during the war with Germany, is hereby reappropriated and made available for the fiscal year 1921, for all expenses, including the employment of clerical and other help in the office of The Adjutant General of the Army."

Mr. President, this same question arose in the Committee on Appropriations and there was a certain amount of money appropriated in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill for The Adjutant General's office. The statement was made, as I remember it, that a part of the additional amount was for this very purpose and other purposes, but particularly this purpose was mentioned. The Committee on Appropriations of the Senate increased the appropriation for the War Department about \$500,000, and the Secretary of War allotted to The Adjutant General's Department even more than the House gave it, and, as I understand it, gave them that increase to accomplish this very work. I would like to know something about the reason why now this same subject is brought into this bill.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, \$3,500,000, as the Senator knows, was appropriated for this current fiscal year, and it was the intention of The Adjutant General to finish the work within the year. There seemed, however, to have been some failure to secure an appropriation sufficient to hire a sufficient number of clerks to do the listing and collating of these records.

According to the testimony of The Adjutant General, there has been expended or obligated up to March 15 of this year \$1,750,071.83, leaving a balance as of that date of \$1,749,928.17.

Then he goes on to say:

I anticipate we will expend, between now and June 30, \$950,000, so that the probable unexpended balance on June 30 will be \$799,928.17.

In other words, in round figures, \$800,000 will be left unexpended, which will be reappropriated by the language of this bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I did not know the exact amount, but I knew it was the purpose of the amendment to give whatever amount was unexpended on June 30 of this year to The Adjutant General's office to be expended the coming fiscal year. If I am not mistaken, Mr. President, this very question was taken care of in the legislative appropriation bill; and if so, this is simply a duplication of an appropriation amounting to \$800,000 which should not be granted.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I feel quite certain that the Senator is mistaken. This Senate committee amendment, as printed on page 7, is the exact language which was reported from the House Committee on Military Affairs and stricken out upon the floor of the House on a point of order.

Mr. SMOOT. That may be.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Not on the ground that it was not estimated for. It was not criticized, as I recollect it, because it was taken care of in another appropriation, but because the person making the point of order had the idea that it was new legislation; and it was stricken out in such a way that if the Senator will read the complete section he will find that it leaves the section meaning nothing at all. When we were in-

formed of this error, an obvious error, the Senate committee restored the language.

I have in my hand a copy of the hearings on the Army appropriation bill. On page 242 there is printed a letter from the Secretary of War, addressed to me as chairman of the committee, in which letter there is contained a portion of a letter which the Secretary of War addressed to Mr. Goon, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House. It is written under date of January 26, 1920, and a portion of it reads as follows:

Gen. Harris, The Adjutant General, has advised me that, at his hearing before your committee on the 2d instant, you expressed the opinion that it would be inadvisable to increase his clerical force by bringing into this city additional clerks to complete before June 30 the statements of service for the various State adjutants general of the men from their respective States who served in the World War, and suggested that it would be more economical and better in every way for Congress to make the unexpended balance of the appropriation for that purpose available during the next fiscal year. I heartily agree with you in this, and have directed Gen. Harris to confine his efforts in the future to increasing his force by the employment of only such clerks as may be released from other bureaus or departments in this city.

Had it not been for my compliance with the suggestion of Mr. Goon, a sufficient clerical force would have been employed by The Adjutant General to finish this work before June 30.

The Adjutant General appeared before the Senate committee and told us that if this amendment was not made the whole work would have to stop because there was no other appropriation anywhere to take care of these people, and apparently Mr. Goon must have had that understanding as a result of the letter written to him by the Secretary of War.

Mr. SMOOT. What was the date of that letter?

Mr. WADSWORTH. January 6, 1920.

Mr. SMOOT. The legislative appropriation bill was passed after that date.

I want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that in the legislative appropriation bill there was an appropriation made for temporary employees, and the House provided \$2,500,000. The Adjutant General, as well as the Secretary of War, appeared before the Appropriations Committee of the Senate and asked that that amount be increased to \$4,000,000, and of the \$4,000,000 they asked that The Adjutant General's office be given \$2,000,000. Out of the appropriation of \$2,500,000 the House gave The Adjutant General's office \$1,850,000 and the Senate increased the amount to \$2,000,000.

Mr. President, as I remember the testimony—I have not a copy of it here—the very reason assigned at that time for the increased appropriation is covered in this amendment, together with other items which I do not recall. When the bill went to conference the conferees compromised and appropriated \$3,000,000, and out of that \$3,000,000 The Adjutant General's office was given \$1,850,000.

Of course, I do not like to say that this is going to be spent without any returns whatever, but I think that wherever there is an appropriation made which falls within one appropriation bill it ought to be made within that particular appropriation bill and not be divided between two appropriation bills. The temporary employees of the War Department fall in the legislative appropriation bill, and the members of the Appropriation Committee thought they had taken care of the situation. The conferees compromised on \$500,000 more than the House was willing to give, and it was for the purpose of taking care of temporary employees, among other things, to do the work which is provided for in this amendment. I know the Senator from New York would not want to make two appropriations, and I ask the Senator from New York if this amendment was put in as a result of the letter of January 6?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No, Mr. President; it was put in this bill by the Senate committee on the direct testimony of The Adjutant General, who said that if he did not have it the work of completing these draft records would stop. He appeared in person, pointed out what had happened on the floor of the House, and how the House committee had put in this same language. They apparently had been persuaded that there was no duplication and that it was absolutely necessary.

Mr. SMOOT. The legislative appropriation bill was not put upon the calendar of the Senate until May 14 of this year, and I am fearful that this is a duplication of an appropriation.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Of course, I will not contradict the Senator, though I am convinced he is mistaken. To me it is inconceivable that The Adjutant General of the Army would come before the Committee on Military Affairs, knowing this matter was being taken up by the Committee on Appropriations, and ask the Committee on Military Affairs to give him more money. I can not believe that he would do it.

Mr. SMOOT. It has been done right along. If they can not get it on one appropriation bill, they will try to get it on another.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I wonder if the Senator quite understands the meaning of his statement.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I do understand it. I do not say that The Adjutant General has done it in this case, but if the Senator wishes I can call attention to similar cases time and time again.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have merely this to say about it: I do not believe Gen. Harris would do a thing like that in order to deceive the Military Affairs Committee. I can not believe it.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not now say that Gen. Harris has done so.

Mr. WADSWORTH. He was the only witness.

Mr. SMOOT. But I do say that Gen. Harris appeared before the Committee on Appropriations and asked for an appropriation for the employment of temporary employees, and I do say that the Senate Committee on Appropriations, on his testimony and that of the Secretary of War, increased the appropriation \$1,500,000; and it is true that in conference we had to agree to \$3,000,000 instead of \$4,000,000, as the Senator knows.

Mr. CURTIS. I suggest that the amendment go over until the secretary of the committee can telephone and find out about it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have already sent a message to The Adjutant General to find out if such a thing is possible. If it is, I shall be exceedingly disappointed.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator knows this, does he not, that these employees are provided for in the legislative appropriation bill?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No. There were a great many employees who were not provided for in the legislative appropriation bill, which I shall point out later on.

Mr. SMOOT. Temporary employees?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Temporary employees, large numbers of them.

Mr. SMOOT. Then they are added to this bill.

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; they are not added to this bill. The Senator is mistaken. The Committee on Appropriations, when it drafted that provision in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, forgot completely that there was an Air Service in the Army and that it was not authorized by statute, and it failed utterly to take care of the employees in the office of the Director of the Air Service. If it goes into law without amendment, every employee in the city of Washington working in the Air Service or in the construction division must be discharged.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say that there was no one representing the Air Service or the War Department who ever called attention of the Appropriations Committee to it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. They had no notice whatsoever that any such provision was contemplated.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator think that the War Department does not know what is in the legislative appropriation bill when it passes the House? It was before the committee, and we had before the committee men representing every division of the War Department.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Whether they had notice or not, I have described accurately the effect. They will all have to be discharged, every civilian employee in the Air Service, every one in the construction division, every one in any bureau or branch of the War Department who has not heretofore been authorized to exist by statute. Furthermore, no salary can be paid to any of them over \$1,800. Every draftsman will have to be discharged, and every designer of aircraft. They are temporary civilian employees.

Mr. SMOOT. They would have been provided for if any estimate had come to the Committee on Appropriations. It would have been put in the proper appropriation bill. I am not objecting where a failure has been made on the part of officials of the War Department to call it to the attention of the Appropriations Committee, but I do think the time will come when we will have to know where the appropriations are to be made and in what appropriation bill they are to be included, and that when the bill is presented to Congress they must be made in the proper bill and not have one appropriation bill carry one amount and the same department of the Government have the same purpose provided for in two or three bills.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am in entire sympathy with the Senator from Utah in the suggestion which he has just made. We ought to get these things straightened out, but the Senator must remember that the Army is in a state of flux; that the war-time organization, which is a temporary organization under the provisions of the Overman Act, is still in existence. Many

branches and services of the Army are temporary from the legal standpoint. It became absolutely incumbent upon the Committee on Military Affairs, when it was informed of the action of the Committee on Appropriations, to try to do something to save the civilian employees in the temporary branches of the Army. That has been attempted in this bill. Much as we regret it, we had to make a proposal which would violate the very healthy principle which the Appropriations Committee inserted in their bill; but, unfortunately, this is a perfect instance illustrating the necessity of some decently contrived budget system.

Here is the great Committee on Appropriations, charged with the duty of viséing the appropriations to pay the civilian employees of the War Department and all the other departments here in Washington. The Committee on Military Affairs is charged with viséing the appropriations for the support of the Army as such, exclusive of the civilian employees employed in the War Department by the Army. The Overman Act comes along as a war measure and makes it absolutely impossible to do anything except to employ these temporary civilian employees under the appropriations of the Military Affairs Committee. The Committee on Appropriations never hears of them; the Committee on Military Affairs never hears of what the Appropriations Committee has done; and the result is utter confusion; and here the Senator from Utah and the Senator from New York myself have stood and tried to straighten it out. I wish we had a system where we would never get into such a mess.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to say that if we ever have a reorganization of the different departments of the Government, among other things just such things as this will be straightened out. All I am interested in is that there shall not be two appropriations for the same purpose. If Congress has placed that amount in the appropriation bill for The Adjutant General's office, through the legislative appropriation bill, The Adjutant General ought to know it and does know it. Then to have him come to the Committee on Military Affairs and ask for what the Appropriations Committee had turned down seems to me to be out of place.

This may not be such a case, but it does look to me that it is. I will say, by the way, the first time I noticed it was when it was read from the desk. If it turns out to be such a case, I am quite sure the Senator from New York will let it go out.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Certainly. Let the amendment be passed over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. New in the chair). The amendment will be passed over.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Chief of Coast Artillery," subhead "Coast Artillery School, Fort Monroe, Va.," on page 8, line 17, after the word "specialists," to strike out "\$10,540" and insert "\$15,000," so as to make the clause read:

For purchase of engines, generators, motors, machines, measuring instruments, special apparatus, and materials for the division of enlisted specialists, \$15,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Office of the Chief Signal Officer," subhead "Signal Service of the Army," on page 9, line 21, after the word "officer," to insert "and the Signal Corps School, Camp Alfred Vail, N. J.," so as to read:

Telegraph and telephone systems; Purchase, equipment, operation, and repair of military, telegraph, telephone, radio, cable, and signaling systems; signal equipments and stores, field glasses, telescopes, heliographs, signal lanterns, flags, and other necessary instruments; wind vanes, barometers, anemometers, thermometers, and other meteorological instruments; photographic and cinematographic work performed for the Army by the Signal Corps; motor cycles, motor-driven and other vehicles for technical and official purposes in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of communication or signaling systems, and supplies for their operation and maintenance; professional and scientific books of reference, pamphlets, periodicals, newspapers, and maps for use in the office of the Chief Signal Officer and the Signal Corps School, Camp Alfred Vail, N. J.; telephone apparatus, including rental and payment for commercial, exchange, message, trunk-line, long-distance, and leased-line telephone service at or connecting any post, camp, cantonment, depot, arsenal, headquarters, hospital, aviation station, or other office or station of the Army, excepting local telephone service for the various bureaus of the War Department in the District of Columbia, and toll messages pertaining to the office of the Secretary of War.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Air Service," on page 11, line 20, before the word "officers," to strike out "aviation"; on page 12, line 19, after the word "employees" to strike out "outside" and insert "within"; line 20, after the word "Columbia," to insert "and elsewhere," so that the sentence will read:

Salaries and wages of civilian employees within the District of Columbia and elsewhere as may be necessary, etc.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I see that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] is present. Here is the case to which I referred a moment ago. I want to be fair with the members of the Committee on Appropriations and indicate to them just what this supposedly small amendment does.

On page 12, line 19, the Senator will note the language is to be made to read "salaries and wages of civilian employees within the District of Columbia and elsewhere." This is under the head of Air Service, and it is to make it possible for the money in this appropriation to be used to pay the temporary civilian employees in the Air Service who otherwise could not be paid owing to a provision in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to ask the Senator if the committee took into consideration the provision made in the legislative appropriation bill for that purpose?

Mr. WADSWORTH. There is no provision in the legislative appropriation bill for these employees.

Mr. CURTIS. Then, so far as the committee is concerned, of course we could not have any objection to it here; but if it is to be continued every year, it ought to go in the legislative appropriation bill instead of this bill.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The point is that when we get the Army reorganized, though I do not know when it will be, we will have established under the law an air service in the Army. We have not got it now.

Mr. CURTIS. I was not on the subcommittee having charge of the legislative appropriation bill, and therefore have no knowledge as to whether the question was considered. I wish to ask the Senator if he knows whether the item for this work was submitted to the Appropriations Committee by the department, or did they rely wholly upon placing it in the Army appropriation bill?

Mr. WADSWORTH. They relied entirely upon the Army appropriation bill, because that is the only way they have been paid in the past. The Air Service is a war-time temporary organization.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an inquiry?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Certainly.

Mr. KING. My attention has been called during the past few days—and I am asking now for information—to a proposition which it was alleged existed to deny the Navy the right to control its Air Service, and to consolidate under the control of the Army the Air Service of the Army and the Air Service of the Navy. Does this bill effectuate that purpose?

Mr. WADSWORTH. There is a provision which has something to do with the subject to which the Senator alludes, but let me say to him that the danger of the death of naval aviation is greatly exaggerated. That item will be reached in just a short time. It is not nearly as bad as the first reports indicated.

Mr. CURTIS. While on that point, I wish to ask in behalf of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] that the item on page 14 may go over until he returns to the Chamber. I think that is the item the Senator refers to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have already made an agreement with the Senator from Massachusetts that when that is reached it will be passed over until he returns.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator why the amount for the Air Service was raised from \$27,250,000 to \$40,000,000?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I may say at this point that the bill as reported from the Senate committee carries a total of \$418,000,000, as contrasted with the estimates of the department amounting to \$982,000,000. It is less than half the amount asked for by the War Department. The House passed the bill carrying an appropriation total of \$376,765,824. We have added \$42,153,317, making a total carried in the bill, as presented to the Senate, of \$418,919,141. The principal elements in the increase in the bill over the House figures are this aviation item and the appropriations for the pay of the Army.

Briefly, this is the situation with respect to the aviation item. The Senator from Utah will probably remember the extended debate we had on the Army appropriation bill for the current fiscal year, and that, as a result of the conference between the two Houses on that bill, the Army aviation got a \$25,000,000 appropriation, and the same amount was given to the Navy, although the Army aviation is four times as large, or it should be. With that \$25,000,000 given to the aviation branch of the Army this year that service has been able to maintain itself as to the fields and the training schools, the research and engineering work largely done at Dayton, experimental work on machines, the pay of civilian employees, draftsmen, engineers, experts, and other ordinary maintenance items and has also been able to secure the

manufacture of the impressive number of five airplanes, on an experimental model, one each.

With the exception of those five—and they are experimental—all the airplanes now in the possession of the Army of the United States are two years old. Most of them are De Havilland 4's which were manufactured during the war, which proved to be of bad design, and several of which have been remodeled as to the placing of the seats in the fuselage, in order that the American flier, if he comes to grief in the machine, may have some show for his life. Those machines, as I have said, are all two years old; they are out of date as compared with the machines of other countries.

We also have a few German Fokkers, which constitute our share of the division of the airplanes which the German Government surrendered under the armistice. We also purchased at the end of the war a few British SE-5's. All those machines are two years old; comparatively they are out of date. The best testimony that the Military Affairs Committee can get is that by the end of another year they will all be worn out and will not be safe for flying, and by that time the Army of the Republic will have no airplanes at all worthy of being called serviceable and up to date.

The Aviation Service have asked for an appropriation of \$60,000,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair ventures to remind the Senator from New York that they asked for an appropriation of \$83,000,000 last year.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW], the present occupant of the chair, reminds me that their request for the current year was for \$83,000,000; but for next year they have asked for \$60,000,000. The House of Representatives gave them \$27,000,000. They came before the Military Committee and showed us, as we think conclusively, that if they are confined to an appropriation of \$27,000,000 they will not be able to produce a single airplane type during the next fiscal year, and that, as a result, at the end of the next fiscal year the fliers of the United States Army will have to walk on the ground. They said that, with an appropriation of \$60,000,000, they expected to build and would build 600 airplanes of four or five different types—the five types to which I referred a moment ago—of the most modern up-to-date machines, all of which have now been approved. Those types of machines were tested out at Dayton not long ago with eminent success; indeed, I have heard flying officers say that those machine types are as good as anything in the world, and they performed some rather remarkable feats in the test.

The committee of the Senate believed that we owed it to the country to see to it that the American Air Service had machines in which to fly. We did not give them the \$60,000,000 they desired, but we propose to give them \$40,000,000. We figured roughly that instead of 600 machines, which they said they wanted to build with the \$60,000,000, they could build two or three hundred machines with the \$40,000,000, and we propose to the Senate to appropriate a sufficient sum of money to let the Air Service of the Army of the United States have two or three hundred airplanes at the end of the next fiscal year.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I hesitate to criticize provisions of this bill which have received the attention of the Senator from New York. It is not unduly complimentary to say of him that he has given earnest and devoted service to the work of the Military Affairs Committee, and, with a desire to secure the best for the country, he has submitted measures only after the fullest examination of the provisions and items therein. However, I do want to submit this observation: There was appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, more than \$36,000,000 for the aviation branch of the Army. Notwithstanding this large appropriation, there seem to be no results or any sort of a record of achievement. Millions were expended and not a machine constructed. When the war ended there were, I am advised, supplies, machinery, and so forth, on hand and under the control of the aviation branch of the War Department worth hundreds of millions of dollars. Millions were expended during the war for the construction of machines and to acquire machinery, factories, and other construction instrumentalities. Notwithstanding the stupendous appropriations made during the war and the large appropriations made to the War Department for aviation purposes after the war, we are advised that the aviation section is practically broken down, and that there are but few machines suitable or available for the service. It seems incredible that this great organization created during the war should be disintegrated and that the millions which it expended should have brought no results. It would seem that there has been great waste and extravagance in the administration of the funds and in expending the appropriations made. I am afraid that there have been too many

officers in the service, too many employees, too many alleged experts, too many persons who absorbed the funds appropriated but produced no results. If ten or fifteen millions of dollars had been placed with some competent business organization, I believe it would have produced a number of machines suitable for the Air Service. And yet, with an appropriation many times that amount since the war, there are still no machines.

I remember reading some months ago figures showing the personnel of the Air Service, and I felt at the time there was too much machinery, too much administration, and too much bureaucratic inefficiency. What has become of the millions appropriated? Certainly some machines should have been built, and yet we are told there are no machines, that no machines have been constructed, and that the Air Service is in a chaotic condition.

I believe, Mr. President, that an examination of the records of the War Department will furnish convincing proof that the overhead expenses, if I may be permitted to use such a phrase, of the department are too great and the returns much too small for the huge sums invested. Thirty-six to forty millions of dollars seems small as those figures are measured by the more than one billion appropriated for the Air Service during the war, but in these days of peace that amount should bring results. The trouble with too many officials of the Government is that they talk in hundreds of millions of dollars instead of hundreds of thousands of dollars. They feel that unless they have millions nothing can be done. I am afraid that there is an indifference upon the part of public officials to the value of money. There is not that conservation and economy that should exist. If thirty-six millions produced no machines, it is a question in arithmetic to determine how much money will be required to produce one machine. It was expected that the large sum of money appropriated for the current fiscal year would have brought some results. It is regrettable that it seems to have brought only ruin. The record submitted is not a very creditable one, and unless there is prompt and radical change it would seem the part of wisdom to take away from the War Department any duty whatever of providing aircraft. If the millions appropriated are to be expended in overhead charges and otherwise, it would be far better to select some other agency to provide aircraft needed by the Government. No adequate explanation has been offered for the apparent maladministration in the Aircraft Service. It was inefficient in war. It seems to be inefficient in peace.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There being no objection, the amendment offered by the committee is agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs was, on page 13, line 19, after the words "Air Service," to insert "for printing and binding, including supplies, equipment, and repairs for such Air Service printing plants at stations outside of the District of Columbia as may be authorized in accordance with law; for publications, station libraries, special furniture, supplies, and equipment for offices, shops, and laboratories; for special services, including the salvaging of wrecked planes."

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the chairman of the committee what is the necessity of appropriating for the establishment of printing plants? Does the Aircraft Service conduct a printing business?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No, Mr. President. If the Senator will take a copy of the bill in his hand and look at it he will observe that the language which appears in the Senate committee amendment on the bottom of page 13 is the language which is stricken out from the middle of page 14. It is merely a transposition of the same provision from page 14 to page 13, in order to make sense in the context of the whole section. As passed by the House, through some error, the sentence did not connect up at all. We have simply made a transposition of the provision. The printing to which the Senator refers is blue printing of designs and sketches of airplanes and engines.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment reported by the committee is agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 1, after the word "planes," to strike out "\$27,255,000" and insert "\$40,000,000"; and in line 11, after "\$150,000," to strike out "for printing and binding, including supplies, equipment, and repairs for such Air Service printing plants at stations outside of the District of Columbia as may be authorized in accordance with law; for publications, station libraries, special furniture, supplies, and equipment for offices, shops, and laboratories; for special services, including the salvaging of wrecked planes."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 23, after the word "fleet," to insert "including fleet shore bases," so as to read:

And provided further, That hereafter the Army Air Service shall control all aerial operations from land bases, and that Naval Aviation shall have control of all aerial operations attached to a fleet, including fleet shore bases.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the last proviso on page 14, which has just been read, is a very important one, and there are several Senators who desire to discuss it. The Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] has just told me that he hopes it may be allowed to go over until Monday, and I should be very glad to have that course taken, for, I repeat, several Senators wish to discuss it, and I know there is great opposition to it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have no objection to its going over until Monday, but before it goes over I merely wish to say that the amendment as printed in the bill is not the committee amendment, which I am authorized to offer, and that at the proper time—

Mr. LODGE. Perhaps the Senator has had the proposed new amendment printed.

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; it has not been printed.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator probably can have it printed, so that we may see it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I will read it, so that it will go into the Record in that way, and, if it is necessary to have it printed, I ask that that may be done. At the end of line 23, after the word "fleet," it is proposed to add "including shore station whose maintenance is necessary for operations with the fleet, for construction and experimentation and for the training of personnel."

That language, I am absolutely sure, will not interfere with anything the Navy wants to do. I have that assurance from the head of the Naval Aviation Service.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I ask the chairman of the committee to have this amendment passed over for the time being, and allow it to come up on Monday in order that we may confer in regard to the proposed change.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have no objection to that.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The entire subject matter was introduced in the bill, really without consultation with the Navy Department, and without any hearing before the Naval Committee.

It affects very vitally the Naval Aviation Service. I am very much obliged to the chairman of the committee for allowing it to go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over until Monday.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs was, on page 15, after line 3, to insert:

That piece of land reclaimed and to be reclaimed now the property of the United States Government known as Bolling Field, sections A and B, in the District of Columbia, on the east side of the Anacostia River extending from the Glesboro Point upstream to the outfall sewer at Poplar Point lying between the Anacostia River sea wall and the original high-water shore line on the east, is hereby set aside for use as a military reservation to be used for aviation purposes: *Provided*, That funds heretofore appropriated for the reclamation of this area shall remain available for this purpose.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I ask the Senator in charge of the bill where the land referred to in the amendment is located with reference to the present Bolling Field?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is Bolling Field.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It is what is now known as Bolling Field, and includes the land upon which the hangars are built, and so on.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; it is all Government land. I think at present it is under the jurisdiction of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and the object of the amendment is to transfer it to the War Department.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I know there is some additional land being reclaimed further on, and I thought probably the amendment included that land. I wanted to know why it was necessary to include additional land, but, as I understand from the Senator, it includes the land that is now known as Bolling Field.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The land known as Bolling Field; and may I say that this provision was submitted to the District Commissioners, and apparently met with their approval in its descriptive language.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I thought it was including additional land in Bolling Field. I supposed that the Army already controlled Bolling Field. I have no objection to this transfer of jurisdiction.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Navy is there also. Why there should be two overheads on one field I never have been able to understand.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I am glad the Senator is putting it under one. I think that is far better.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I suggest that the Senator study the amendment which has gone over until Monday on that very ground—of stopping duplication.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs was, on page 15, after line 13, to insert:

That the military reservation known as Chapman Field, now under the control and jurisdiction of the War Department, lying on the western side of the Biscayne Bay, near Miami, Fla., is hereby transferred to and placed under the control and jurisdiction of the Navy Department for the use of the Naval Service.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 19, to strike out:

For the acquisition, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, of 640 acres of land, more or less, and the appurtenances thereunto belonging, situate in Macomb County, State of Michigan, now occupied by the Air Service of the Army as an aviation station, and known as Selfridge Field, not to exceed \$190,000.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] is interested in this item, and I think I assured him that I would ask that it be passed over if he should be absent from the Chamber when it came up. I do not see him here. I ask, therefore, that it may be passed over for the present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs was, on page 16, line 1, to strike out the headline "Quartermaster Corps."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Pay, and so forth, of the Army," subhead "Pay of officers," on page 16, line 4, after the word "line," to strike out "\$18,265,230" and insert "\$25,000,000," so as to make the clause read:

For pay of officers of the line, \$25,000,000.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I think it is due to the Senate for me to make a statement in connection with this matter of pay.

The House, in passing this bill, estimated for an Army of an average strength of 175,000 enlisted men during the next fiscal year. It is true, of course, that the authorized strength of the Army would be a good deal more than 175,000 men, but it is apparent from the recruiting figures and the statistics indicating the number of discharges which are daily or weekly taking place in the Army that we will not have in the Regular Army during the next fiscal year much more than 175,000 enlisted men on an average, so the House appropriations were supposed to be sufficient to pay for an Army of 175,000 men. As a matter of fact, the House appropriations would not pay for an Army of 175,000 men by some millions. The House simply cut the amount underneath that, even; but since the House passed this bill the Congress has passed and the President has signed the new Army and Navy increased-pay bill, so it became incumbent upon the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate to meet the new obligation arising from the new pay law. It has been necessary, therefore, for the Senate committee to increase the appropriations of the House in order to pay, or come within shooting distance of paying, 175,000 men and the appropriate complement of officers for the next fiscal year at the new rates of pay; and may I say to the Senate that the figures submitted by the Senate committee are themselves insufficient to pay 175,000 men at the new rates for the next year, although they are very close to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs was, on page 16, line 6, after the word "department," to strike out "\$12,294,915" and insert "\$18,000,000," so as to make the clause read:

For pay of the officers of staff corps and departments, \$18,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Pay of enlisted men," on page 16, line 17, after the word "line," to

strike out "\$54,889,391" and insert "\$62,000,000," so as to make the clause read:

For pay of enlisted men of the line, \$62,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 20, after the word "departments," to strike out "\$16,512,405" and insert "\$19,000,000," so as to make the clause read:

For pay of enlisted men of the staff corps and departments, \$19,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Pay of Army field clerks and civil-service messengers at headquarters of the several territorial departments, Army and corps headquarters, territorial district, tactical divisions and brigades, service schools, camps, and ports of embarkation and debarkation," on page 19, line 20, after the word "light," to strike out "\$310,705" and insert "\$400,000," so as to make the clause read:

For commutation of quarters and of heat and light, \$400,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 23, after the words "Quartermaster Corps," to strike out "\$79,668" and insert "\$100,000," so as to read:

For commutation of quarters and of heat and light for field clerks, Quartermaster Corps, \$100,000: *Provided*, That said clerks, messengers, and laborers shall be employed and assigned by the Secretary of War to the offices and positions in which they are to serve: *Provided further*, That no clerk, messenger, or laborer at headquarters of tactical divisions, military departments, brigades, service schools, and office of the Chief of Staff shall be assigned to duty in any bureau of the War Department.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "General appropriations, Quartermaster Corps," subhead "Subsistence of the Army," on page 22, line 20, after the word "including," to insert "warrant officers of the Mine Planter Service"; and on page 23, line 25, after the word "including," to insert "warrant officers of the Mine Planter Service," so as to read:

Purchase of subsistence supplies: For issue as rations to troops, including warrant officers of the Mine Planter Service, enlisted men of the Regular Army Reserve and retired enlisted men when ordered to active duty, members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps at camps, civil employees when entitled thereto, hospital matrons, nurses, applicants for enlistment while held under observation, general prisoners of war (including Indians held by the Army as prisoners, but for whose subsistence appropriation is not otherwise made), Indians employed with the Army as guides and scouts, and general prisoners at posts; for the subsistence of the masters, officers, crews, and employees of the vessels of the Army Transport Service; hot coffee for troops traveling when supplied with cooked or travel rations; meals for recruiting parties and applicants for enlistment while under observation; for sales to officers, including members of the Officers' Reserve Corps while on active duty, and enlisted men of the Army: *Provided*, That the sum of \$12,000 is authorized to be expended for supplying meals or furnishing commutation of rations to enlisted men of the Regular Army and the National Guard who may be competitors in the national rifle match: *Provided further*, That no competitor shall be entitled to commutation of rations in excess of \$1.50 per day, and when meals are furnished no greater expense than that sum per man per day for the period the contest is in progress shall be incurred. For payments: Of commutation of rations to the cadets of the United States Military Academy in lieu of the regular established ration, at the rate of \$1.08 per ration; of the regulation allowances of commutation in lieu of rations to enlisted men on furlough, enlisted men and male and female nurses when stationed at places where rations in kind can not be economically issued, including warrant officers of the Mine Planter Service, enlisted men of the Regular Army Reserve and retired enlisted men when ordered to active duty, and when traveling on detached duty where it is impracticable to carry rations of any kind, enlisted men selected to contest for places or prizes in department and Army rifle competitions while traveling to and from places of contest, male and female nurses on leave of absence, applicants for enlistment, and general prisoners while traveling under orders.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Regular supplies," on page 27, line 10, after the word "reports," to strike out "\$28,000,000" and insert "\$32,000,000," and in line 11, after "\$32,000,000," to strike out "*Provided*, That not to exceed \$52,230 may be used in the erection and completion of an ice and cold-storage plant at Schofield Barracks," so as to make the clause read:

Regular supplies of the Quartermaster Corps, including their care and protection; construction and repair of military reservation fences; stoves and heating apparatus required for the use of the Army for heating offices, hospitals, barracks and quarters, and recruiting stations, and United States disciplinary barracks; also ranges, stoves, coffee roasters, and appliances for cooking and serving food at posts, in the field, and when traveling, and repair and maintenance of such heating and cooking appliances; and the necessary power for the operation of moving-picture machines; authorized issues of candles and matches; for furnishing heat and light for the authorized allowance of quarters for officers, including members of the Officers' Reserve Corps when ordered to active duty, and enlisted men, warrant officers, and field clerks, including enlisted men of the Regular Army Reserve and retired enlisted men when ordered to active duty; contract surgeons when stationed at and occupying public quarters at military posts; for officers of the National Guard attending service and garrison schools, and for recruits, guards, hospitals, storehouses, offices, the buildings erected at

private cost, in the operation of the act approved May 31, 1902, and buildings for a similar purpose on military reservations authorized by War Department regulations; for sale to officers, and including also fuel and engine supplies required in the operation of modern batteries at established posts; for post bakeries, including bake ovens and apparatus pertaining thereto and the repair thereof; for ice machines and their maintenance where required for the health and comfort of the troops and for cold storage; ice for issue to organizations of enlisted men and officers at such places as the Secretary of War may determine, and for preservation of stores; for the construction, operation, and maintenance of laundries at military posts in the United States and its island possessions; for the authorized issues of laundry materials for use of general prisoners confined at military posts without pay or allowances, and for applicants for enlistment while held under observation; authorized issues of soap, toilet paper, and towels; for the necessary furniture, textbooks, paper, and equipment for the post schools and libraries, and for schools for noncommissioned officers; for the purchase and issue of instruments, office furniture, stationery, and other authorized articles for the use of officers' schools at the several military posts; for purchase of relief maps for issue to organizations, commercial newspapers, market reports, etc.; for the tableware and mess furniture for kitchens and mess halls, each and all for the enlisted men, including recruits; for forage, salt, and vinegar for the horses, mules, oxen, and other draft and riding animals of the Quartermaster Corps at the several posts and stations and with the armies in the field, and for the horses of the several regiments of Cavalry and batteries of Artillery, and such companies of Infantry and Scouts as may be mounted; for remounts and for the authorized number of officers' horses, including bedding for the animals; for seeds and implements required for the raising of forage at remount depots and on military reservations in the Hawaiian and Philippine Islands, and for labor and expenses incident thereto, including, when specifically authorized by the Secretary of War, the cost of irrigation; for straw for soldiers' bedding, stationery, typewriters and exchange for same, including blank books and blank forms for the Army, certificates for discharged soldiers, and for printing department orders and reports, \$32,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Incidental expenses," on page 28, line 13, after the words "Quartermaster Corps," to insert "and finance service," so as to read:

Postage; cost of telegrams on official business received and sent by officers of the Army, including members of the Officers' Reserve Corps, when ordered to active duty; extra pay to soldiers employed on extra duty, under the direction of the Quartermaster Corps, in the erection of barracks, quarters, and storehouses, in the construction of roads, and other constant labor for periods of not less than 10 days; as additional school-teachers during the school term at post schools, and as clerks for post quartermasters at military posts, and for overseers of general prisoners at posts designated by the War Department for the confinement of general prisoners, and for the United States disciplinary barracks guard; of extra-duty pay at rates to be fixed by the Secretary of War for mess stewards and cooks at recruit depots who are graduates of the schools for bakers and cooks, and instructor cooks at the schools for bakers and cooks; for expenses of express to and from frontier posts and armies in the field; of escorts to officers or agents of the Quartermaster Corps to trains where military escorts can not be furnished; hire of laborers in the Quartermaster Corps, including the care of officers' mounts when the same are furnished by the Government, and the hire of interpreters, spies, or guides for the Army; compensation of clerks and other employees of the Quartermaster Corps and finance service, and clerks, foremen, watchmen, and organist for the United States disciplinary barracks, and incidental expenses of recruiting.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead of "Transportation of the Army and its supplies," on page 29, line 6, after the word "including," to insert "the warrant officers of the Mine Planter Service"; on page 30, line 18, after the word "paid," to insert "for the purchase and hire of draft and pack animals in such numbers as are actually required for the service, including reasonable provision for replacing unserviceable animals; for the purchase, hire, operation, maintenance, and repair of such harness, wagons, carts, drays, other vehicles, and motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles as are required for the transportation of troops and supplies and for official, military, and garrison purposes; for drayage and cartage at the several depots; for the purchase and repair of ships, boats, and other vessels required for the transportation of troops and supplies and for official, military, and garrison purposes; for expenses of sailing public transports and other vessels on the various rivers, the Gulf of Mexico, and the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans"; on page 31, line 7, after the word "Oceans," to strike out "\$38,000,000" and insert "\$45,000,000"; on page 32, line 15, after the word "acts," to strike out "for the purchase and hire of draft and pack animals in such numbers as are actually required for the service, including reasonable provision for replacing unserviceable animals; for the purchase, hire, operation, maintenance, and repair of such harness, wagons, carts, drays, other vehicles, and motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles as are required for the transportation of troops and supplies and for official, military, and garrison purposes, provided," and insert "Provided further, That"; in line 24, after the word "expended," to strike out "for the purchase of any motor-propelled vehicles nor"; on page 33, line 3, after the word "use," to insert "except such use as is prescribed by order for the transportation of Army personnel in connection with the recreational activities of the Army"; and in line 5, after the word "Army,"

to strike out "or for any purpose except for military and official business; for drayage and cartage at the several depots; for the purchase and repair of ships, boats, and other vessels required for the transportation of troops and supplies and for official, military, and garrison purposes; for expenses of sailing public transports and other vessels on the various rivers, the Gulf of Mexico, and the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans," so as to read:

For transportation of the Army and its supplies, including transportation of the troops when moving either by land or water, and of their baggage, including the warrant officers of the Mine Planter Service, members of the Officers' Reserve Corps, enlisted men of the Enlisted Reserve Corps, and retired enlisted men when ordered to active duty, including the cost of packing and crating; for transportation of recruits and recruiting parties, of applicants for enlistment between recruiting stations and recruiting depots; for travel allowance to officers and enlisted men on discharge; for payment of travel allowance as provided in section 126 of the act approved June 3, 1916, to enlisted men of the National Guard on their discharge from the service of the United States, and to members of the National Guard who have been mustered into the service of the United States and discharged on account of physical disability; for payment of travel pay to officers of the National Guard on their discharge from the service of the United States, as prescribed in the act approved March 2, 1901; for travel allowance to discharged prisoners and persons discharged from the Government Hospital for the Insane after transfer thereto from such barracks or place to their homes (or elsewhere as they may elect), provided the cost in each case shall not be greater than the place of last enlistment; of the necessary agents and other employees including per diem allowances in lieu of subsistence not exceeding \$4 for those authorized to receive the per diem allowance; of clothing and equipment and other quartermaster stores from Army depots or places of purchase or delivery to the several posts and Army depots and from those depots to the troops in the field; of horse equipment; of ordnance and ordnance stores, and small arms from the foundries and armories to the arsenals, fortifications, frontier posts, and Army depots; for payment of wharfage, tolls, and ferriages; for transportation of funds of the Army; for the payment of Army transportation lawfully due such land-grant railroads as have not received aid in Government bonds (to be adjusted in accordance with the decisions of the Supreme Court in cases decided under such land-grant acts), but in no case shall more than 50 per cent of full amount of service be paid; for the purchase and hire of draft and pack animals in such numbers as are actually required for the service, including reasonable provision for replacing unserviceable animals; for the purchase, hire, operation, maintenance, and repair of such harness, wagons, carts, drays, other vehicles, and motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles as are required for the transportation of troops and supplies and for official, military, and garrison purposes; for drayage and cartage at the several depots; for the purchase and repair of ships, boats, and other vessels required for the transportation of troops and supplies and for official, military, and garrison purposes; for expenses of sailing public transports and other vessels on the various rivers, the Gulf of Mexico, and the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, \$45,000,000: *Provided*, That such compensation shall be computed upon the basis of the tariff or lower special rates for like transportation performed for the public at large, and shall be accepted as in full for all demands for such service: *Provided further*, That in expending the money appropriated by this act a railroad company which has not received aid in bonds of the United States and which obtained a grant of public land to aid in the construction of its railroad on condition that such railroad should be a post route and military road, subject to the use of the United States for postal, military, naval, and other Government services, and also subject to such regulations as Congress may impose restricting the charge for such Government transportation, having claims against the United States for transportation of troops and munitions of war and military supplies and property over such aided railroads, shall be paid out of the moneys appropriated by the foregoing provisions only on the basis of such rate for the transportation of such troops and munitions of war and military supplies and property as the Secretary of War shall deem just and reasonable under the foregoing provision, such rate not to exceed 50 per cent of the compensation of such Government transportation as shall at that time be charged to and paid by private parties to any such company for like and similar transportation; and the amount so fixed to be paid shall be accepted as in full for all demands for such service: *Provided further*, That nothing in the preceding provisions shall be construed to prevent the accounting officers of the Government from making full payment to land-grant railroads for transportation of property or persons where the courts of the United States have held that such property or persons do not come within the scope of the deductions provided for in the land-grant acts: *Provided further*, That no money herein appropriated shall be expended for the hire, operation, maintenance, or repair of any motor-propelled vehicle, which shall be employed wholly or in part for personal, social, or similar use, except such use as is prescribed by order for the transportation of Army personnel in connection with the recreational activities of the Army.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, after the words just stricken out, to insert:

Provided further, That hereafter when, in the opinion of the Secretary of War, accommodations are available, transportation on Army transports may be provided for the members and employees of the Porto Rican Government and their families without expense to the United States: *Provided further*, That in the discretion of the Secretary of War, and when space is available, civilian passengers and shipments of commercial cargo may be transported on Army transports at rates not less than those charged by commercial steamship companies, between the same ports, for the same class of accommodations, the receipts from which shall be covered in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, I regret to interfere with the orderly procedure in disposing of this important measure; but, very frankly, I feel that it is a mistake in any event to include what I think must be admitted to be general legislation on an appropriation bill, and in this particular case a type of

general legislation that directly affects a policy which the Senate only yesterday practically agreed to in the passage of the merchant marine bill; in other words, to endeavor to encourage the establishment of a merchant marine and its development, and gradually to get it into the hands of private initiative and private energy. Now, we come along and add to an Army appropriation bill a proviso that transports in the Army service shall engage in regular commercial business, carrying passengers and shipments of cargo from islands in the Caribbean to American ports. In other words, we are practically running a merchant marine in two departments of the Government, not to speak at all of the question which it seems to me should be given careful consideration by Congress, that of governmental competition with private interests already engaged in conducting steamship routes in that same territory.

I have here a letter from a well-known American company from which I will read just a few lines for the information of the Senate. This letter is from the A. H. Bull Steamship Co., having a fleet of, I think, some 12 or 15 ships, conducting a regular weekly service between New York and Porto Rico, the island that is involved in this amendment:

Previous to the war we gained a place in the transportation between this island and the United States by the hardest kind of work and the keenest kind of competition. The Government then requisitioned all our ships, and we had to take, as all lines did, such vessels as were allocated to us to maintain more or less of a service. The service was not adequate, but it was a war emergency, and could not be avoided. However, many shippers in the island of Porto Rico did not appreciate this. Others at the different ports have clamored for Shipping Board vessels, and lines have been started to the island from Baltimore, Jacksonville, and the Gulf. In no way are they creating new business, but are simply taking from the lines that operated there previous to the war, and we do not believe they are operating on a paying basis. The Army now comes along and wishes to make further competition. We do not believe it is right that they should be permitted to do a commercial business, and we look with apprehension on this continued attempt to interfere with private transportation companies. We can not conceive how we can go to a banker and negotiate loans to operate passenger steamers if we have to admit that the United States Army Transport Service is to be a competitor.

I think the merit of the case will itself appeal to the Senate; but outside of that, or attempting to create a division as to the question of governmental competition, the strong point, I think, is the one that I have already alluded to—that we are attempting through the merchant-marine bill to establish and develop generally a merchant marine, and all of our energy from a governmental standpoint should be confined to that particular branch of the service. But I shall not bring up the question to have it decided from either standpoint, because I think a simple point of order is quite sufficient to remove it from the bill. I again express regret to interfere in any way with the passage of this bill, but I am sure the chairman will admit and agree with me that that particular provision has no relation to the necessary appropriations for the Army and is general legislation of a character that at its best is doubtful.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I ask the Senator from New Jersey to withhold the point of order for a moment.

Mr. EDGE. I will be very glad to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I appreciate that it probably will be regarded as well taken, but I would like to say something about this matter.

Mr. EDGE. I shall be very glad to withhold it.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator permit me to make a suggestion? I would like to have him answer it, and it is cognate to the point the Senator from New Jersey has been discussing. If I may be permitted to ask it, he may answer them both while he has the floor. Complaints have been made to me that the War Department, in the utilization of its transport system, has sent boats to various parts of the United States and to its insular possessions loaded very slightly, at tremendous cost. If a few soldiers or a few officers were to be transported or a few tons of freight were to be carried, the Government, at great expense, would employ a transport. It could have at one-tenth of the expense employed private boats which were plying between the points in question and have gotten the same results. I have no knowledge whatever of the complaints. There may be absolutely no foundation to those complaints, but they have been made to me repeatedly, and if the Senator knows anything in regard to the matter I should be very glad to hear his explanation.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, these two amendments, printed in italics on page 33, are a genuine effort to save some money for the Government of the United States, and I think it is high time that we took a little thought on that question.

The Senator from Utah has just referred to what I believe to be a fact, that certain Army transports sail only partly loaded with cargo and partly used for passengers. That, under the present situation, is inevitable; it can not be prevented, because it is absolutely necessary for the War Department to

run a regular transport service. The ships must sail on a certain day, and they must reach the end of their voyage upon a certain day or thereabouts, in order that certain types of supplies may go forward and reach their destination.

For example, we have 17,000 officers and men on the Rhine. Antwerp is the terminal at which our transports unload the supplies destined for our troops on the Rhine, and from Antwerp they are taken up the river by barge, as I understand it. Of course, it will be seen right away that it is absolutely necessary for the War Department to run a regular service back and forth across the Atlantic, keeping in touch with that force, and it is perfectly true that at times the cargoes do not fill the holds of the vessels; and yet what is put in the vessel has to be taken, and it is perfectly true that many of the cabins are empty because there is not personnel being sent across sufficient to fill the cabins.

This legislation is meant to authorize the Secretary of War to make use of that vacant cargo space and that vacant passenger space in transporting civilian commercial cargo and civilian passengers at the same rates charged by commercial steamship companies, and to try to get some return for the taxpayers, who have paid for the transports and who pay for their operation.

It is not meant to compete with commercial lines, because it is especially provided that they must charge as much as commercial lines charge. The operation of these transports, it is hoped, will not continue long. It is not conceivable that we will maintain an army upon the Rhine indefinitely. They may return within the year; they may be there for two years or three years; no one can tell. As soon as our troops on the Rhine return our operation of transports across the Atlantic ceases; but while they are being operated, I say, for heaven's sake let us get some return from them.

The chief of transportation, Gen. Hines, is firmly convinced that a most substantial revenue can be brought into the Treasury of the United States if this provision remains in the bill. I shall regret exceedingly if the Senator from New Jersey shall press the point of order. He says that it has nothing to do with the appropriation of funds for the support of the Army. Technically that is true; but it has something to do with the saving of the very funds that the bill deals with.

The first of these two amendments relates only to transports touching at Porto Rico, and let me say just a word about that. It will be noted that the first amendment reads that—

Hereafter when, in the opinion of the Secretary of War, accommodations are available, transportation on Army transports may be provided for the members and employees of the Porto Rican Government and their families without expense to the United States.

What is the situation? There are a considerable number of school-teachers in Porto Rico who make it a custom to visit the United States every summer. They go to summer schools here, they spend their vacations here as a relief from their work in that tropical climate. Word comes from them, through the Governor of Porto Rico, that the commercial steamers touching at Porto Rico bound for the United States are so packed with passengers, and the space in them reserved so far ahead, that these poor people have very little chance of reaching the United States at all this year. It is a provision intended to permit those school-teachers to get to the United States this summer. And they pay their own way. It is to be without expense to the United States.

Of course, the Senator from New Jersey can raise the point of order against both these amendments, but I submit, Mr. President, if he does so, he does more harm than good.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, I have not the slightest objection to the first provision in the amendment—the provision which the Senator has just discussed—on the contrary, I approve of it. It provides that members and employees of the Porto Rican Government and their families may be transported without expense to the United States in Army transports. That is a very small matter. It is too small a matter to make a question about, and I intended to differentiate between the two provisions of the amendment.

But the other portion of the amendment I must most respectfully insist is unfortunate and is unwise, and puts the Government in direct competition with established business of the country, which we encourage. We ask in every way that American capital and American initiative engage in this enterprise, and especially in view of the fact that we are now—

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. EDGE. I will yield just as soon as I am through with this statement. I say we are now attempting to centralize our whole commercial merchant marine activity in one department, which we have authorized by a bill which passed only yester-

day, an extensive department. If the transports are to be used, and it is deemed wise that they should be used, in some sections of the world for cargoes or passengers, then I feel it should come through the Shipping Board, and that two departments of the Government should not attempt in a way—

Mr. WADSWORTH. How can the Shipping Board run an Army transport?

Mr. EDGE. I do not think they can. For that reason I am making the point of order. But I do not think two departments of the Government should be engaged in this same general activity, when one department is trying to organize and establish it on a firm basis.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator does not mean to say that it would be a general activity on the part of the Army transports?

Mr. EDGE. I do not know. I am not sure.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I described the situation. I am sorry I have not succeeded in persuading the Senator. I venture to say that the gentleman who wrote him takes a mighty selfish view of the situation. It is not in the slightest degree the purpose of the Federal Government, as that letter apparently seeks to convey, to compete with commercial lines. These Government boats must sail full or empty; it makes no difference; they must go; and this provides that when they go half filled with Government cargo the Government can take in some commercial cargo to fill the remaining space and charge the prevailing commercial rates, and those only.

May I say to the Senator from New Jersey that a bill has already passed the Senate, a separate measure, providing essentially for this very same thing?

If the Senator will permit me, I am going to put into the Record the names of these transports, their tonnage, their capacity, and whatever information is available, because I want this matter understood.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator yield to me for a brief statement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from New Jersey yield for a question?

Mr. EDGE. I will yield for a question or a brief statement. I do not want to yield the floor.

Mr. ROBINSON. If the Senator will withhold his point of order, I want to make a brief statement.

Mr. EDGE. I am going to finish my remarks in just a few minutes, principally in answer to the last suggestion of the Senator from New York.

I am fundamentally opposed to the Government being in business, to start with. Whether this individual case is one of merit or not I personally do not know, but the general policy of the Government engaging in private business in competition with the business interests of the country I am opposed to, whether it happens to be a small matter or a large matter. In my judgment the sooner the Government disengages itself from private business and uses the great functions of Government, the great power of Government, to cooperate with business, the better the country will be as a result. So, for that reason, I felt it very unwise, without consideration, to make such a departure and to incorporate that type of general legislation in an appropriation bill. I am fundamentally opposed to the principle and shall be until I am strongly convinced to the contrary.

Mr. POMERENE. I want to ask the Senator one question.

Mr. EDGE. I shall be very glad to answer it.

Mr. POMERENE. Does not the Senator from New Jersey think it would be very bad policy for the Government, owning and operating as it does these transports, to continue to operate them at a greater expense, when, if they were permitted to use them temporarily for the purposes indicated by the committee amendment, they could be operated at a less expense?

Mr. WADSWORTH. And it is only for a few months, or a year, at the most.

Mr. EDGE. As the Senator from Ohio propounds the question, considering it directly from the particular interest involved as explained by the Senator from New York, I answer yes. But I am speaking of the general principle, and if we are going to amend that general principle and still engage in business activity on the part of the Government, I want to do it through the consideration of a separate measure, which will give us the opportunity to properly qualify it by amendment, or at least to give it some consideration. I am opposed to this type of important legislation going through Congress on an appropriation bill.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It has already passed the Senate in a separate bill.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, there is another feature of the subject which I think requires attention. The Senator from New York has stated the case as it relates to passengers from Porto Rico. That condition exists at many Central American and South American ports, and it is noticeably true of the Panaman ports. There are perhaps 500 to 1,000 persons on the Isthmus of Panama who have been seeking passage to the United States for some weeks, and many of them for some months. How can the Senator from New Jersey justify striking this provision from the bill when the ships which are now plying to those ports are inadequate to accommodate the passengers who have applied for transportation?

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, since I am asked the question—

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator declined to yield to me, but I shall be glad to yield to him—

Mr. EDGE. Let the Senator finish his statement.

Mr. ROBINSON. The condition I have referred to as prevailing in Panama exists in Haiti. Haiti has never had adequate passenger transportation. So, considering the fact that this provision merely warrants the use to their fullest capacity of facilities which must be used by the United States, facilities which will be operated probably at an expense any way, it does seem to me that the Senator ought to be induced not to make the point of order.

The people who are seeking passage would be glad to procure it from private companies or on ships privately operated, but, as I have already stated, those facilities are inadequate and there is no prospect in the immediate future that the accommodations will be sufficient to meet the requirements of the traveling public. Then why in the name of reason should these passengers not be permitted to travel on these transports, since they must be operated, as the Senator from New York has already pointed out?

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, I do not propose to prolong the discussion, but I wish just briefly to answer the Senator from Arkansas. We have some 2,000 ships to-day, I understand, owned by the Federal Government and under the control of the Shipping Board. Within that tonnage there is almost every type and description of ship.

I have understood, through attending various hearings of the Committee on Commerce, that we are particularly oversupplied with what are known as ships built originally for or suitable at least for coastwise transportation; in other words, they have so many of them that I think it is common knowledge that the Shipping Board has already accepted offers from aliens to sell some of the ships, because they could not find any way to use them on this side.

The Shipping Board under a bill recently passed is going to endeavor to establish lines, encourage new lines, allocate ships to existing lines, and do everything possible to meet any business situation where the possibilities of business would be sufficient to warrant such a service. I feel that they should have an opportunity to carry that out.

The Government has invested over \$3,000,000,000 in these ships, and I do not feel that it is good business suddenly to give almost unlimited powers, resting simply on a decision of the Secretary of War, to use our transport service in any way that he may wish, in passenger or cargo traffic. It goes even further than the Senator from Arkansas states.

Therefore until a bill comes before us in a way that we can at least qualify it, discuss it, amend it, or give it that consideration which the importance of the measure would warrant, I must insist upon the point of order.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Before the Senator insists upon the point of order, I wish to call attention to the fact that the bill which the Senate passed September 8, 1919, with reference to this matter lays down in considerable detail, over two pages of the bill, the conditions upon which the Secretary of War may allow the use of the transports. That bill has been favorably acted upon by the House committee, with some amendments that were suggested, and is now on the House Calendar.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It has been passed by the Senate.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It occurs to me that it would be well to allow this matter to take the regular course and be acted upon in the regular bill instead of trying to put it into the Army appropriations bill, without the limitations and directions and restrictions that the Senate put in the bill when it passed it and to which the House has agreed.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Would the Senator from New Jersey be willing to accept the bill passed by the Senate instead of the amendment printed in the Army appropriation bill?

Mr. EDGE. Speaking personally, I have not the bill before me—

Mr. WADSWORTH. Here is a copy of it.

Mr. EDGE. And I have not had an opportunity to study it. It is a bill that requires considerable consideration. I want to be courteous to the Senator from New York, the chairman of the committee, because I recognize his interest in the whole subject. The very best I can do for him under the circumstances, I think, is to allow the point of order to go over and the amendment to be passed over until we have some opportunity to study the bill that has already passed the Senate on the same subject.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is presumed the Senator studied the bill at that time.

Mr. EDGE. If the Senator will allow me to withhold the point of order temporarily, with the understanding that we shall come back to it when we finish the other portions of the bill, I shall be very glad to do that.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Very well.

Mr. President, I desire to place in the RECORD some testimony on this subject, so that it will appear in the proceedings in a consecutive manner. I read from the testimony of Gen. Hines, Chief of Transportation, before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs:

The matter is simply this: To-day the transport frequently has to sail with passenger space and cargo space not completely filled. There are hardly sufficient commercial vessels in operation, at least at this time, and perhaps within the next year, to take care of all the commercial needs, and it seems the part of wisdom, at least good business, for the Government to utilize completely all the space on these vessels as long as we are compelled to operate them.

He continues:

Gen. HINES. We have no desire to compete with commercial companies; we have no desire to go out and advertise for business, but when cargo is waiting and passengers are unable to get commercial accommodations and are willing to take the class of accommodations that we have, it seems to me that we should be authorized to utilize that space.

Senator CHAMBERLAIN. Have you made any estimate of what that revenue would be?

Gen. HINES. Yes, I have. I estimate, if we are permitted to do this, that we will at least derive a revenue of \$3,000,000 on the Atlantic.

That is, this next summer. The point of order suggested by the Senator from New Jersey is to deprive the people of this country of \$3,000,000 of revenue. I interject that as a part of the testimony of Gen. Hines.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Certainly.

Mr. ROBINSON. In addition to that, ships privately owned and operated are carrying their fullest capacity. The effect of the point of order will be to deprive those desirous of securing passage of the opportunity to do so.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Commercial ships, passenger and commercial, are crammed to the gunwales to-day. There are people of my personal acquaintance who have been trying to get passage to Europe for weeks and they can not get a reservation.

What have we on the Atlantic in the way of Army transports? I will continue reading from the testimony of Gen. Hinds:

Senator CHAMBERLAIN. You are only using the residue, always providing for the Government needs?

Senator THOMAS. Surplus accommodations?

Gen. HINES. Yes; surplus accommodations. Of course, at this time on the Atlantic that would probably be going to Europe, because we are utilizing most of the space coming back for our own needs, in returning the 10,000 Polish-Americans that are to come out of Danzig.

The Senator will remember, doubtless, that I introduced and secured the passage of a bill in the Senate, which later passed the House, authorizing the War Department to use its Army transports in bringing home the Polish-Americans who went abroad as members of the famous Polish Legion and fought with the allied armies, who later were sent to Poland and who assisted in the defense of Poland against her many enemies, and who finally, with their service expired, had no way of getting back to America. Our Army transports are now bringing them back. Sixteen hundred of them have been brought back, and there are now about 8,000 more of them to bring.

Then the chairman of the committee asked Gen. Hinds:

The CHAIRMAN. How many ships are you operating regularly on the Atlantic, trans-Atlantic?

Gen. HINES. I think I will put this in the record, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it in the House record?

Gen. HINES. I will put it in the record here. We have seven in the straight trans-Atlantic service and two in the canal service; that is, one running from New York to the Panama Canal, and one from New Orleans to the Panama Canal. The one from New York is a cargo and passenger ship and the one from New Orleans is utilized principally in transferring cargo from the Army base to the Canal, to give them the reserve that they need down there. The fleet on the Atlantic is made up of the smaller of the ex-German vessels, of the *Antigone* and the *Pocahontas* class.

Then follows a table showing the names of the vessels, their tonnage, and their cargo capacity. In the Atlantic there are 11 vessels that run from 4,500 dead-weight tons up to 15,000, the smallest being the old *Kilpatrick* and *Buford*, and the largest being the *Nansemond*. Their capacity in cargo runs from 1,500

tons to 8,400 tons. Each of those vessels in the next year may make five or six or seven trips. It is the purpose of the provision to permit them to earn a little money and save the taxpayers of the country what they are able to earn.

I ask unanimous consent that the table printed at the bottom of page 350 of the hearings before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The table is as follows:

Daily bulletin of Army transport operations.

Name.	T. D. W.	Passenger capacity.			Ship will carry with troops—	
		1 Cl.	2 Cl.	3 Cl.	Refrigerator cargo.	General cargo.
Atlantic:						
<i>Antigone</i>	11,000	128		2,793	148	2,714
<i>Buford</i>	6,000	64	18	970	261	1,500
<i>Kilpatrick</i>	4,529	62	36	947	175	1,751
<i>Mercury</i>	10,350	100		2,572	553	2,037
<i>Nansemond</i>	15,002	9			459	8,493
<i>Pocahontas</i>	10,550	253		1,877	416	1,500
<i>Princess Matoika</i>	10,300	155	8	2,376	319	1,275
Total	67,731	771	62	11,535	2,322	19,273
Panama:						
<i>Northern Pacific</i>	6,000	141		2,316	323	500
<i>Santa Leonora</i>	5,325	81		1,377	37	2,000
Total	11,325	222		3,693	360	2,500
Pacific:						
<i>Crook</i>		64	16	1,247		3,500
<i>Dix</i>	9,939	1,527				8,839
<i>Great Northern</i>	6,000	165		2,941	179	1,000
<i>Logan</i>	5,327	209	84	1,684	407	1,696
<i>Marica</i>	12,100	41			30	9,075
<i>Sherman</i>	5,227	216	84	1,715	456	1,567
<i>South Bend</i>	12,000	40			30	9,075
<i>Thomas</i>	5,280	280	84	1,876	460	1,650
Total	55,873	1,015	268	9,463	1,562	34,402

¹ Animals.

² Without animals.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I understand there is no point of order raised against the amendment authorizing the transportation of the Porto Rican school-teachers? There are two separate amendments.

Mr. EDGE. There is absolutely no point of order against the first half of the suggested amendment.

Mr. WADSWORTH. There are two separate amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that there is no point of order raised on the first proviso and that the point of order raised against the second proviso is temporarily withheld by the Senator from New Jersey. The RECORD will so show.

EX-PRESIDENT TAFT'S VIEW ON BONUS BILL.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the Philadelphia Ledger of to-day published an article upon the bonus from the pen of ex-President Taft, and I desire to impose upon the patience of the Senate long enough to read it into the RECORD. The heading is: BONUS BILL SHOULD BE ALLOWED TO DIE—IT IS CONTEMPTIBLE POLITICS TO PRESS IT WHEN A PRESIDENTIAL VETO IS PRACTICALLY ASSURED. (By William Howard Taft. Copyright, 1920, by Public Ledger Co.)

"It is to be hoped that the Republicans of prominence who met to consider the platform in Washington exercised a useful influence upon the Congressmen and Senators, and made them to know how unwise is the plan to vote a cash bonus to 4,000,000 ex-service men. There is substantially no demand for the bonus except from those who are to receive it; it is doubtful whether a majority of them favor it. The pinch of the high cost of living makes everyone else except the beneficiary of the bonus impatient at the thought of this very heavy additional burden to be put upon the people.

"The slumping Government bonds, the tenseness of the situation produced by the obstruction to interstate commerce, the tightness of money, the continued high cost of living, and all the uncertainties due to threatened strikes should give our legislators at Washington pause.

"Hundreds of thousands of men and women were induced through patriotic appeals to subscribe to Government bonds at an interest rate much too low and have been compelled to sell them at a heavy sacrifice. They will certainly have a right to complain if conditions now are to be made worse for them in the cost of living and greater taxation by the bonus project. The times are critical, and the voluntary assumption of this ad-

ditional and unnecessary load is foolishness in the extreme. It is politics gone mad.

"The Republican Party has been most emphatic in denouncing wasteful extravagances on the part of the Democratic administration and has urged the necessity for a change in government in order to secure economy and retrenchment. With what sincerity can the party make this appeal if it becomes responsible for the unnecessary expenditure of \$1,500,000,000 or \$2,000,000,000?

"All but the ex-service men and a great many of those will hope, if the bill passes the two Houses, that the President will veto it, as he ought. If we may judge from the evidence of the Secretary of the Treasury he will advise the President to do so.

"Can it be that those who are pressing this bill are themselves hoping that by pushing it through they can secure the favor of the beneficiaries and then by the veto can avoid its burden, putting the political responsibility for its defeat on the administration? Such politics would be contemptible; such a theory is incredible; but the Republicans who favor the bonus will expose themselves to such a charge in the face of the present financial and business crisis. The majority party in each House should do the right and the just thing and let the bonus bill die."

It is to be hoped, Mr. President, that the House of Representatives will take to heart this warning from one of the most eminent Republican statesmen of the age and follow the advice thus given.

TEACHERS—THEIR IMPORTANCE—THEIR COMPENSATION—THEIR FUTURE.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to a situation in this country in regard to teachers that ought to be generally known, for when it is once known the unfortunate condition which now prevails throughout the entire United States in regard to the education of our children will be speedily remedied. If there is one thing upon which the American people are united, it is their determination to provide increasingly adequate educational facilities through every grade.

There are now 647,172 teachers in the United States. Of this number, 562,184 are teachers in the elementary grades and 84,988 are teachers in the high schools. In a very real sense this body of patriotic Americans are the guardians of the Nation's future. They have to do with the American sovereignty of to-morrow.

To-day they are the mighty instruments in the formation of the character and ideals and efficiency of the coming men and women who to-morrow will govern for weal or for woe these United States.

Every instinct of national self-preservation as well as every reason of justice to teachers themselves, and of expediency and wisdom for the welfare of the Nation, demands two things:

First, that there be provided sufficient teachers who are competent, well trained, and well paid to instruct American boys and girls. The very future of our country is at stake. The responsibility placed upon these teachers is too great to permit of any but the best, the most skilled, the most efficient, in training potential American citizens.

Second, that there be provided for these teachers adequate training and adequate facilities in buildings and equipment whereby to perform their high duty, and that there be no failure to recognize the necessity of providing satisfactory living conditions for teachers and for their recreation and recuperation.

In a peculiar sense teachers in their work give themselves; it is a part of their own personality that is expended each day in the classroom. They must not be allowed to grow stale. They must be so situated that, not only in physical vitality but in mental and nerve force, they may build up what their day's work is constantly tearing down.

The teacher in a sense is an illustration of the very principle which was so manifest upon the battle line of the Great War: Those who were in the very pressure of the fight, though uninjured, were always found to need, after a comparatively few days of such intense activity, the recuperating effect of a longer time far back of the fighting line.

A recent report concerning the faculty of Yale University, situated in a great city where music and drama and pictures are available, both for education and recreation, found that the average faculty family of four people were financially able to spend but 65 cents a week for recreation. This is not only a personal deprivation, it is a blow to the efficiency of education. Books and magazines and music and art are as necessary food to sustain the teacher's strength as wrestling and boxing and running are for the athlete.

This need for well-trained, well-paid teachers and adequate facilities for their work and recreation are not merely desirable things; they are absolutely essential in this Republic.

Every American boy and girl, whether on the farm or in the more sparsely settled parts of the country, or in the city, is entitled to receive, and alike for their own sakes and for the welfare of the Nation must receive, that education which will fit them for citizenship.

If there is one place where well-trained, well-paid teachers are more necessary than another place it is with the younger children in the formative years of their lives.

At this time of life the boy and girl must come in contact with a master mind who can not only instruct in the curriculum of the school but which can by example and personal influence as well as by precept stamp upon the imagination of the growing child those great lessons of patriotism and right living and right thinking, both in relation to God and to man, that, once learned by the child, can never be entirely forgotten.

To the consuls of the Empire of Rome there was sent out the mandate that was not only an order but was well known to carry with it dire punishment in case of failure, and it always read, "You are responsible; look to it that the Republic comes to no harm." The same message is the mandate of this country to the great teaching force of the Nation, and that mandate must be accompanied by the compensation and the facilities and the encouragement which make its realization possible.

The tyrannical requirement of the children of Israel that the full quota of bricks should be made without straw must not be repeated in the relation of the United States to their teaching force.

The compensation of teachers is pitifully insufficient. The average salary for elementary teachers in 1918 was \$606 a year; the average salary for high-school teachers was \$1,031. The reports from 47 States in 1919-20 indicate that the average salary of all teachers in rural schools, including both elementary and high-school teachers, was \$633.96.

White men teachers received on an average \$711.68; white women teachers received on an average \$629.96; negro men teachers received on an average \$372.64; negro women teachers received on an average \$358.84. In one State the average of the teaching force received but \$351 a year, and in one State the average salary for teachers in negro schools was \$179 per annum, and the highest average in any State for the rural teachers was \$1,026.

This information is substantially up to date and includes all the increases which have come in the various States up to and including this year. The following table of 1,203 men teachers and 6,758 women teachers, taken from every part of the country, is most suggestive.

I ask that the table referred to be incorporated in the RECORD without reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The table referred to is as follows:

Average rural salaries for all States.

White.	Men.	Women.	Total.
Less than \$500.....	292	1,608	1,900
Over \$500—less than \$1,000.....	707	4,925	5,632
Over \$1,000—less than \$1,500.....	170	213	383
Over \$1,500.....	34	12	46
Total.....	1,203	6,758	7,961

Mr. SPENCER. A study of comparative compensation of teachers and their occupation in California as of 1915 is illuminating, but the inequality is more manifest to-day, for the increase in compensation in every trade and occupation has been proportionately advanced far more than in regard to teachers.

If there is no objection, Mr. President, I submit that table in connection with what I am speaking and ask that it be printed without reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The table referred to is as follows:

Building trades.	Average compensation.
Carpenters.....	\$1, 232
Plumbers.....	1, 296
Painters.....	1, 299
Masons.....	1, 820
Cement.....	1, 288
Plasterers.....	1, 960
Average.....	1, 467
Shipbuilding trades.	Average compensation.
Foremen.....	\$2, 352
Ship fitters.....	2, 240
Punch operators.....	2, 016
Plate hangers.....	1, 960
Helpers.....	1, 680
Journeyman.....	2, 240
Average.....	2, 081

Other selected occupations.	
Machinists	\$1, 134
Sheet metal	1, 456
Shipwrights	1, 230
Blacksmiths	1, 120
Milkman	840
Mailman	1, 000
Compositors	1, 190
Policeman	963
Foremen	952
Average	1, 102
California teachers' salaries.	
Elementary:	
Men	\$1, 050
Women	\$746
Secondary:	
Men	1, 456
Women	1, 331
Principals:	
Men	1, 295
Women	1, 272
Average	1, 267
Average for all	1, 116
Average for all, \$1,550.	

In many places the janitor of the school building receives more compensation than the teacher in the lower grades of instruction. Anywhere it costs more than \$100 a month to employ a man fitted to train a horse, and yet in many places the teacher competent to train the child is not paid \$50 a month.

The Chicago Tribune not long ago reported that hod carriers had been awarded \$8 a day in Chicago. This is five times the average salaries paid to elementary school-teachers, and is more than twice the average salary paid to high-school teachers.

There have been indications of betterment throughout the country, but the need is not so much for a readjustment of salaries as it is for an immediate doubling or trebling of existing compensation, with corresponding requirements as to the qualifications on the part of the teacher.

The result of this indifference to the compensation and welfare of the teachers is precisely what might be expected. In New York City during the month of March, 1920, 115,000 children were sent home because there were no teachers available for their instruction. Last year 143,000 teachers in the United States were forced by insufficient compensation to quit teaching and take up better-paid work. A general condition like this makes the very foundation of the Government tremble.

The supply of scholars is constantly increasing. The supply of teachers is constantly decreasing. On February 13 of this year the Commissioner of Education stated that 18,279 schools were closed because there were no teachers available, and that in addition 41,900 schools were taught by teachers whom he characterized as being "below standard, but taken on temporarily in the emergency."

The State normal schools report a diminished enrollment amounting to between 25 to 50 per cent.

It is estimated that the total graduates of all schools, universities, and normal schools which train for elementary teachers will not exceed 30,000 during this next year, and there are 120,000 positions in the elementary schools which must be filled.

Thirty thousand teachers will be needed for the high schools, and, so far as can be estimated, the total number of graduates from schools and universities who are preparing to teach will not exceed 10,000.

The question is not only a local or State question; it is a national question, because the lack of education in any part of the country affects the entire Nation, and some parts of the country are not able to provide for adequate education except by placing upon themselves an unfair financial burden.

The following table will illustrate this point. I ask also to have the table printed in the Record in connection with my remarks without reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The table referred to is as follows:

	Taxable wealth.	Average attendance.	Taxable wealth divided by average attendance.
Maine	\$1, 030, 266, 547	114, 865	9, 057
Massachusetts	5, 735, 230, 115	506, 910	11, 116
New York	21, 912, 629, 507	1, 288, 047	17, 012
Michigan	5, 169, 022, 532	532, 363	9, 709
Iowa	7, 437, 094, 834	391, 132	19, 014
Maryland	12, 002, 216, 720	167, 931	11, 923
North Carolina	1, 745, 233, 696	410, 140	4, 256
Alabama	2, 050, 014, 767	292, 864	7, 000
Kentucky	2, 152, 097, 565	308, 277	6, 981
California	8, 023, 435, 581	393, 088	20, 411

Mr. SPENCER. The above table shows, for example, that in order to have North Carolina, with a taxable wealth of \$4,256 for each school attendant, have as good schools as California it would be necessary to impose a tax in North Carolina five times as great as in California, because California has a taxable wealth of \$20,411 for each school attendant.

The inability of any State to provide absolutely necessary educational advantages for its children is no reason why those educational advantages should be denied, because every child in this Nation is not alone a citizen of an individual State, but is an essential part of the Nation itself, and the education of every child in the most remote part of the country has its direct influence upon the national welfare.

All that is necessary in connection with the entire subject of efficient education is that the people of these United States shall understand the condition as it is and realize that our very civilization is in the balance.

An intelligent, well-informed, patriotic American citizenship is the only solution of every problem—racial, industrial, or individual—that confronts this Nation, and such a citizenship is only possible as the result of adequate and efficient educational facilities.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I have listened with interest to the eloquent appeal just made by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER] in behalf of the teachers of the public schools in the various States. No one can differ with the statements which he has made that the school-teachers of the United States have been inadequately compensated. No words of eulogy are superfluous which describe the importance of the teachers' work and the great obligations of the people to the teachers for their splendid services.

The founders of this Republic were greatly interested in education. When the Colonies were formed provision was made for education, notwithstanding the vicissitudes and hardships incident to the founding of Commonwealths in the New World. The paramount importance of education was always in the minds of the American people. Indeed, the fathers of this Republic conceived that liberty could not endure except among an enlightened and progressive people. Wherever the pioneer has gone in the building of the New World the schoolhouse and the church immediately followed. No doubt the record shows that in many instances communities made provision for the education of their children before they had suitably cared for their pressing necessities.

The record of the States along educational lines is one of which every American should be proud. Even the States whose population is insignificant and whose wealth is unimportant have ungrudgingly submitted to heavy taxation for the maintenance of a high standard of education. No State, however great its wealth, can claim marked superiority over other States in the splendid rivalry existing for educational and intellectual advancement. The people have felt that the safety of the Nation rested upon the intelligence of their inhabitants and have sought to spread the knowledge that the intellectual leaders of the world possessed.

Every great movement is not uniform in all sections. One Commonwealth will be interested in some important social problem and make greater progress in its solution within a given period than other Commonwealths; and they, in turn, will within a like period give greater emphasis to some moral movement or some educational reform. But it may be said without successful contradiction that the general movement along educational lines and intellectual progress and development throughout the United States has been persistent and its results have been of the highest and most gratifying character. The States have a pride in their schools and in all movements leading to a higher standard of civilization. They can be trusted to do their duty and to carry forward the cause of education. They are not beggars and are not dependent upon the Federal Government for appropriations to support their schools and colleges.

The war brought profound disturbances to our social and economic structure. Dislocations in business, in trades, and in all avenues of human activity and endeavor resulted, and situations which call for relief and conditions demanding amelioration have been and are being brought to the attention of communities and States. We have not always approached the consideration of these questions and problems with that calm and temperate attitude that should characterize the peoples of the mighty Commonwealths within this Republic. There have been evidences of hysteria and unwarranted and dangerous emotionalism. There have been many fadists and extremists who have had impractical and chimerical schemes to meet evils existent and fanciful evils for which no basis is to be found. One of the most characteristic manifestations of the distemper of the people was found, and it still persists, in the contention

that the Government, and by that I mean the Federal Government, can cure all political, social, and economic infirmities and ailments.

There have been too many charlatans and quacks who have sought to administer governmental nostrums as a palliative, if not a permanent remedy, for the inequalities and evils and mistakes found to exist in various parts of the land. It is somewhat remarkable that in a Republic such as ours, with the history and traditions of the past and with the unmistakable lessons which the past has taught, there should be so large a number who accept the dangerous and destructive view of the autocrats and bureaucrats of the past, whose remedy for all the ills of the world was the assertion of greater power by rulers and the creation of more governmental agencies with augmented power and authority.

Accordingly a multitude of good Americans, particularly since the war, have turned to the Federal Government and insisted that it usurp the rights of the people and the powers and functions of the States. The movement seems to be to destroy the States and build up a consolidated and centralized Federal Government. This movement also disregards the Constitution and the limitations and restrictions therein contained. It seeks the destruction of local self-government and aims at the consummation of an absorptive policy which merges States into a consolidated National Government, unhampered, unrestrained, unlimited in its power and authority. It is alleged that the Great War was waged among other things to secure the right of communities to govern themselves, and to prevent the triumph of these consolidating forces which merge commonwealths into one high autocratic and centralized government, and force people of different races and nationalities into one devouring social and political organism. We profess devotion to the theory of the right of self-determination, and proclaim that the happiness of the people would best be promoted by permitting the organization of small States, particularly where ethnic and geographic lines were favorable to such end.

But we are now met with a reverse movement in our own land. Communities are to be swallowed up in more powerful political organizations, and States are to be overwhelmed in the great tidal movement which carries all the interests of the people and of the States into one voracious and destructive Frankenstein. There was a time when the States gloried in their independence. They were "sovereign" States and exercised the powers of sovereigns. They had granted by the Constitution some of their sovereignty to the Federal Government and constituted it their agent and servant with respect to certain national and international concerns. But in their domestic and internal and local affairs and problems they were nations; they were republics; they were clothed with the power and dignity and honors of sovereign and indestructible States. They assumed with pride the responsibility that devolved upon independent and sovereign States. The police powers were jealously guarded. They regarded with suspicion any encroachment by the Federal Government upon their sovereignty. Each State had its own history, its own characteristics, interests, and eccentricities, and felt that while it was a part of the Federal Union it nevertheless was not to be merged into a colloidal mass, losing its identity and its freedom and independence and its high station. The manifold differences among the States made for strength and progress. Uniformity does not necessarily mean advancement. The law of progress is correlated with the law of variation.

These observations are germane to the subject discussed by the Senator from Missouri. There is a propaganda, nation wide, to further weaken the States by transferring to the Federal Government the duty and responsibility resting upon the States of educating all within their borders. It is unquestionably the attribute of a sovereign State to provide the educational system for its inhabitants. It is an invasion of the rights of the States to have some other Government superimpose its educational system upon the people therein or control in any manner the action of such States in relation to the subject.

Certain officials of the Government are engaged in an effort to establish a department of education and to bring under the control of this department the entire educational system of all of the States. Appeals are made to the teachers throughout the land, that if the Federal Government take control of education their salaries will be increased and the educational system will be greatly improved. Of course, I deny the right of the Federal Government to take over the educational systems of the States. It is not its function, and such a plan would be a dangerous assault upon the States and in the end would be an impairment of the freedom of the people.

It is an enticing picture to place before the people and before the teachers, wherein the States are promised large sums of

money from the Federal Treasury for educational purposes. It is appealing to many, and they willingly extend their hands for the gratuity. They do not stop to think that before the Federal Government can make appropriations to the States for educational or any other purpose it must reach out its powerful hand and by exercising its taxing power take money from the pockets of the people within the States. They do not pause to reflect that thousands and tens of thousands of Federal employees would be required to gather the taxes and then to expend them within the States. They close their eyes to the evils of departmental government and the dangers flowing from a bureaucracy which is already a menace to the Republic. Bureaus have so multiplied and Federal officials have so increased that even now it can be asserted that this is a bureaucratic Government.

Those who approve this plan do not stop to consider what the effect of such a precedent may be, and refuse to perceive that if the Federal Government may control the education within the States and take over these domestic and local powers it may and doubtless will extend its power to still greater lengths, so that in the end there will be no "indestructible States of an indestructible Union," but an autocratic, tyrannous, paternalistic Government functioning at Washington, with a thousand arms extending to the confines of every precinct and community, and asserting its authority and power over individuals and political subdivisions and States throughout the land.

Of course, we all agree that the work of the teacher is of supreme importance; that his mission is of the highest character, and his influence and service essential to the progress of the people. I have felt for many years that the teachers were not sufficiently appreciated and the importance of their calling not fully understood. It has been my pleasure to advocate upon many occasions important increases in compensation for teachers.

I have no doubt but that the people of the United States will address themselves with increased interest to the question of education and to the compensation of teachers.

While it is true that teachers have not been sufficiently paid, so it may be said of some other professions. A few years ago I remember reading that the annual earnings of the lawyers of the United States averaged less than \$700 per capita, and it is a notorious fact that the preachers of the United States have been paid even less than lawyers and teachers. Persons engaged in clerical work and in many other important vocations have received but meager salaries.

I have sometimes thought that we are laying too much emphasis upon the question of wages, as if high wages would prove a sure cure for all the evils that now exist. Statements are constantly made that people are leaving their positions in every profession and calling and industry, and entering into some other line of employment, because of the small compensation received. I have no doubt that in many business enterprises, where the profits demand that higher salaries be paid, great injustices are perpetrated upon the employees. In many industries profits are enormous and large salaries are paid, and there is a marked shifting by employees from one industry to another. This condition always follows a great war, and is sure to become more acute where there has been a conflict of such tremendous consequences as the World War through which we have just passed. There is no doubt but what wages have been unequal and that there have been inequalities in compensation which can not be justified. Teachers must be paid more. And there is no doubt but what their just demands will be recognized by the people within the various States.

But because there are inequalities in compensation and because some trades and industries pay large salaries, while others pay too little, that does not justify Federal control or Federal intervention. Because one State may be richer than another is no reason why the sovereignty of that State should be attacked, or the power of the Federal Government be increased by an encroachment upon the States or the reserved powers residing within the people. The Senator has referred to the fact that the hod carrier receives \$7 or \$8 per day. I have no doubt that wages of persons engaged in the building trades have been much greater than the salaries of most teachers, and certainly they have greatly exceeded the compensation paid the clerical help and those engaged in other useful and indispensable pursuits. I want to add, however, that the day is at hand when the man who labors with his hands must be accorded greater recognition in the economic, social, and political life of the communities and States than he has heretofore received. It may be that some who belong to the professional class or the so-called capitalistic class have attempted to arrogate to themselves a superiority over the "man with the hoe" and the toiler,

whose bent form is a protest against injustices. But in this Republic there is political equality, and there must be no social gulfs created based upon professions or callings or trades or character of labor. The man with the trowel or the plane, the man who builds and toils and labors for the production of the commodities which sustain life, must be accorded a high place in our industrial, political, and social organism. There must be more democracy, more equality, more fraternity, more of the genuine spirit of Christian brotherhood.

Mr. President, I join with the Senator in his eloquent tribute to the work of the teacher, and so far as I have any influence I shall exert it among the people within the States in behalf of the teachers and their further advancement and welfare. But I sound a note of warning against the consolidating tendencies of the hour, against the nation-wide propaganda to atrophy the States and to cause to be surrendered to an omnivorous and centralizing power the functions and responsibilities and obligations which under our dual form of Government rest, and properly rest, upon the States and upon the people within the States.

JOINT POSTAL COMMISSION.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, to-day the Joint Postal Commission completed its labors, and work has now begun in the preparation of a report and a bill.

So many inquiries have come to me in the last few days about this report, and so many demands for immediate action, that I feel that I ought to say that the commission this morning agreed to recommend that whenever the bill shall pass, whether before July 1, 1920, or after, the new schedule of salaries shall go into effect as of date July 1, 1920. Of course, Mr. President, I agreed to that resolution of the committee, and at the same time I insisted that the recommendations of the commission should be reported out immediately and that they should be considered before any recess or adjournment. I understand that the Republican steering committee has not put this legislation on its program to be acted on before a recess shall be taken. In this I think the steering committee has made an error and one that I hope it will correct. We Democrats are not only willing but desirous of having action before any recess is taken, and I shall insist that action be not delayed. A very great injustice is being done these employees of the Government, an injustice that should be corrected without further delay.

I want to say if action is not had it will not be the fault of the commission, but the fault of the Republican managers. The members of the commission have worked early and late on this matter. They have postponed other important duties, they have made personal sacrifices, to expedite this work. It has proved a tremendous task, and it is hoped and believed that the work will be satisfactory to the employees and to the Government. I hope the Republican steering committee will reconsider its action and include this legislation in its precess program.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee when the bill to which he refers was introduced?

Mr. McKELLAR. The bill has not been introduced.

Mr. SMOOT. Yet the Senator is complaining that the Republican steering committee has not acted upon it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think the Republican steering committee ought to have included the proposed legislation in its program, because it has been known for quite a while that the Joint Postal Commission had about completed its work, and there is no reason in the world why it should not be acted upon.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, it seems to me this is the smallest, cheapest example of petty politics that I have ever seen brought before the Senate, that a bill should be included for consideration that has not even been introduced in the Senate in connection with a subject that was before a commission and about which nobody knows whether the commission will report on it by June 5 or before the Senate shall adjourn or take a recess.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Let me ask the Senator how long the commission has had the matter under consideration?

Mr. SMOOT. I do not know just the number of months.

Mr. McKELLAR. The commission had the matter under consideration for several months. The task was a large one; the questions involved have been gone into carefully, accurately, and vigorously, and the commission is ready to report its conclusions to the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. Is it a unanimous recommendation?

Mr. McKELLAR. The report is unanimous. Mr. President, it has been stated on the floor time and time again that the legislation proposed by the Joint Postal Commission should be acted upon, and yet there has been no arrangement for it, and

I think the steering committee ought to have included it in its program.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNARY in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield the floor. I have said all I desire to say about the matter.

Mr. SPENCER. May I ask the Senator from Tennessee whether he is a member of that commission?

Mr. McKELLAR. I am a member of that commission.

Mr. SPENCER. And do I understand from the Senator from Tennessee that the commission of which he is a member has not yet reported?

Mr. McKELLAR. It has not yet reported, but its report is ready.

Mr. SPENCER. Do I understand that the Senator from Tennessee is criticizing because no action is taken in regard to a report that it has not yet made to the Senate?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do. I say that the steering committee ought to have included this particular legislation, which everybody concedes should be passed, in its program for action before a recess.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, if this report is ready, as the Senator says, why does he not put it in?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator will have to ask his colleagues on the commission. One of his colleagues is chairman of the commission.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee was so anxious to make the announcement that the commission had concluded its labors that he could not wait for the chairman of the commission to report. I think I have written 500 letters to all parts of this United States, in which I have assured the writers of the letters I was answering that the commission was doing everything in its power to bring the hearings to a conclusion, and that I knew from the expression of every one on the commission to whom I had spoken that the commission would make a report just as soon as possible, and I had not any doubt but that legislation would be passed in conformity with the recommendations of the commission.

Mr. McKELLAR. Why not put it on the program, then?

Mr. SMOOT. So far as a program is concerned, there is no program, and if there was it would be foolish to include something not before the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. I go by the papers, which say that there is a program, and I have heard every Senator say that there is. I remember a complaint of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] that his bill was not on the program. He said so here, I take his word for it.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished Senator from Tennessee who is the chairman of that commission?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I do not think we need be very much disturbed about this situation. The most eloquent portion of the speech of the Senator from Tennessee is the phrase "we Democrats."

Mr. McKELLAR. I did not hear what the Senator said.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is not worth repeating.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think not.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bill and joint resolutions:

H. R. 12626. An act for the relief of certain persons to whom, or their predecessors, patents were issued to public lands along the Snake River in the State of Idaho under an erroneous survey made in 1883;

S. J. Res. 189. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the accounting officers of the Treasury to allow credit to the disbursing clerk of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance in certain cases; and

H. J. Res. 327. Joint resolution repealing the joint resolution of April 6, 1917, declaring that a state of war exists between the United States and Germany, and the joint resolution of December 7, 1917, declaring that a state of war exists between the United States and the Austro-Hungarian Government.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. GRONNA. I ask the Senator from New York if he will kindly allow the appropriation bill to be laid aside temporarily so that I may submit a conference report. If any debate should develop, I agree not to press it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have no objection under those conditions, Mr. President.

Mr. GRONNA. I am directed by the conferees on the part of the Senate to submit a conference report on the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The conference report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12272) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 116, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 249, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert: "Provided, That the amendments relating to cotton provided for in section 6 of the act known as the wheat guaranty act approved March 4, 1919, are hereby recognized and declared to be permanent legislation"; and the Senate agree to the same.

On the amendment of the Senate numbered 93 the committee of conference have been unable to agree.

A. J. GRONNA,
G. W. NORRIS,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

G. N. HAUGEN,
J. C. McLAUGHLIN,
GORDON LEE,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. GRONNA. I will state that the House conferees receded from amendment numbered 116, the grazing amendment. The Senate conferees receded from amendment numbered 249, the Comer cotton amendment, with an amendment making the present law a permanent law. On the free-seed amendment numbered 93 we were unable to agree. I ask that the Senate agree to the conference report, and I will then move that the Senate further insist upon amendment numbered 93 and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. GRONNA. I move that the Senate further insist upon its amendment numbered 93, on which the committee of conference have been unable to agree, request a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. GRONNA, Mr. NORRIS, and Mr. GORE conferees at the further conference on the part of the Senate.

COMMISSION ON THE RACIAL QUESTION.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, I have introduced for the consideration of the Senate a bill known as S. 4267, which is now before the Committee on the Judiciary. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be incorporated in what I am about to say.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, it will be so ordered.

The bill (S. 4267) introduced by Mr. SPENCER April 21, 1920, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That a commission of nine persons, citizens of the United States, be, and is hereby, created to be known and designated as the Commission on the Racial Question in the United States of America.

The commission shall be composed of three white men from the South, three white men from the North, and three colored men.

SEC. 2. That said commission shall be appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall be divided into three groups of three men in each group, two white and one colored; that the term of the first group shall be for one year, the second group for two years, and the third group for three years.

SEC. 3. That the commission shall have authority to inquire into and thoroughly investigate the conditions surrounding the colored people in the United States, ascertain, if possible, the cause of the unrest among them, and, if there be racial friction, the cause of the same, and to suggest such remedies as they may deem best calculated to relieve the situation and to bring about harmonious relations between white and colored Americans.

They shall have power to send for persons and papers, administer oaths and affirmations, employ experts, and, when necessary, travel from place to place in order to ascertain the true conditions affecting the interests of the colored people in different sections of the United States.

SEC. 4. That the expense of the commission shall not exceed the sum of \$50,000 for any one fiscal year; to include compensation of the commissioners when engaged in actual service of the commission not exceeding \$15 per day; rental of quarters if not otherwise provided for;

traveling expenses; clerk hire, and all other necessary expenses connected with the work of the commission.

The expenses of each commissioner, when in active service of the commission, shall not exceed the sum of \$7 per diem.

SEC. 5. That the commission shall report to Congress, at the beginning of each session in December, the findings of the commission for the year in which the report is made, and shall also give an itemized account of the expense of the commission during that year.

SEC. 6. That the commission shall have the power to fix the compensation of a secretary, not exceeding \$3,600 per year, and to make rules governing the procedure and workings of the commission.

SEC. 7. That the commission shall be under the supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, who shall approve all drafts upon the Treasury, made by the authority of the commission, before they are allowed.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, this bill relates to one of the emergency problems with which our country has to do, one that involves alike our national welfare and that fundamental justice which has so signally characterized our history.

There are approximately 12,000,000 of the negro race in the United States. In mere numbers, as in efficiency and patriotism, they are an essential part of American life. In some parts of the Union they outnumber the white race. The absolute necessity of mutual confidence and understanding and cooperation between the white race and the colored race needs only to be stated in order to be at once recognized by both alike.

The fundamental basis upon which the race question must be considered and determined is that the colored man of the United States is a citizen precisely as the white man of the United States is a citizen. Each is an American; each has proved his loyalty to the principles for which our flag stands; each has fought its battles and shared in its victories; and each is entitled to the equal protection of the law in his life, in his property, and in his liberty. Any attempt to deny this equal right before the law is more of a disgrace to those who attempt it than it is to those who suffer by it.

On December 18, 1865, there was finally adopted the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which provided that—

Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.

Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

The first State to ratify this amendment was the Republican State of Illinois, which ratified it on the same day on which it was submitted to the States by Congress—February 1, 1865—and there followed in rapid succession a number of Republican States. The last State to ratify it was Georgia, on December 9, 1865, though six States ratified it after it had become a part of the Constitution.

THE NEGRO AS THE OWNER OF PROPERTY.

Since that time the negroes of the United States have acquired property worth more than \$1,000,000,000.

They have acquired lands exceeding 21,000,000 acres, an area greater than the entire State of South Carolina, and cultivate an equal amount in addition, owning or renting approximately two-thirds of the cultivated land of the South. The 50 years of progress of the negro race in the United States has surpassed any progress under any like circumstances in the history of the world.

When the Russian serfs were emancipated in 1861, they had in 50 years accumulated approximately \$36 for each individual, amounting in the aggregate to perhaps a half a billion dollars. The negroes, in the first 50 years of their freedom, acquired nearly double that amount—\$70 for each individual, with an aggregate of \$700,000,000.

The real estate which the negro has acquired is a permanent investment.

The negro is a home-acquiring race. The census of 1910 shows that 506,590 homes were owned by negroes, of which 221,535 were farm houses and 285,055 were homes in the city.

The census of 1920, following the same ratio as in previous years, will undoubtedly show more than 600,000 homes owned by negroes.

The negro has established more than 50,000 successful business enterprises. One hundred insurance companies are owned by negroes. Banks doing an annual business of \$20,000,000 and with a capitalization of nearly \$2,000,000 mark their activity in finance.

THE NEGRO IN WAR.

In the war, of men selected by the draft, 74.60 per cent of the negroes were accepted, and 69.71 per cent of the whites were accepted. The first soldiers of the American Army decorated for bravery were two negroes, Henry Johnson and Needham Roberts, of the Three hundred and sixty-ninth Infantry, which was formerly the Fifteenth New York National Guard.

Four whole negro regiments, the Three hundred and sixty-ninth, Three hundred and seventieth, Three hundred and seventy-first, and the Three hundred and seventy-second, and the First Battalion of another negro regiment, the Three hundred and sixty-seventh, were awarded the *croix de guerre* for heroism in action. In addition, there were some 400 individual medals of honor granted to negroes for bravery in action. This statement, made by Robert R. Moton, principal of Tuskegee Institute, at the American Sociological Congress, in May, 1920, gives striking evidence of the patriotism and loyalty which has so nobly characterized this part of our citizenship.

The negroes provided \$225,000,000 for Liberty loan and war-work activities. There was a contribution of \$100,000 by a wealthy negro farmer, David R. Raines, of Louisiana. There was one contribution of 15 cents, which was the entire worldly wealth of Gilbert Denham, an 87-year-old negro of Greenville, Ala.

Three hundred thousand negroes, with cheerfulness and efficiency and with songs and laughter, worked long hours and oftentimes in mud up to their knees as stevedores, unloading and transmitting supplies and ammunition without which the American Army could not have existed.

THE NEGRO IN EDUCATIONAL AND PROFESSIONAL LIFE.

In education, 300 counties are employing colored supervising industrial teachers with an annual pay roll of \$292,752 fitting teachers to take care of the small country school.

In 1910 there were 29,727 negro teachers, 34,962 negro ministers, 3,409 physicians and surgeons, 478 dentists, and 7,056 in other occupations, making a total of over 70,000 in professional life. To-day more than 40,000 teachers are presiding over schools, in which 2,000,000 negro children are enrolled.

In the ministry their eloquence in the preaching of their gospel and their fidelity to the exacting duties of this high office is perhaps best illustrated by the confidence and reverence of the constantly increasing number to whom they minister. More than \$68,000,000 have been, with much sacrifice, invested in permanent church property.

In law every large community recognizes and appreciates the existence and the exceeding helpfulness in the administration of the law of the negro lawyer who with the years acquires greater confidence and cooperation in the profession.

In medicine, not alone in the general practice among their race in the alleviation of the suffering and the remedying of disease and injury, but as well in the fields of research and medical literature the negro has taken a place of prominence almost incredible in its importance when it is remembered the comparatively short time in which this as well as other avenues of professional life have been freely and fully opened to him.

More than 1,000 patents have issued to him and speak with no uncertainty of his part in that inventive genius which has so conspicuously been manifested in the history of our country.

Five hundred newspapers and periodicals are edited and published by negroes in an ever-enlarging determination to keep their race informed of current events and of governmental and general principles with which every citizen ought to be familiar.

The race problem is no more the negro problem than it is the white man's problem. It affects both alike, and upon its right solution depends the welfare of each race, as well as in no small degree the stability of our Nation. It is not the problem of the South any more than it is the problem of the North. The mere fact that a large majority of the colored population of the country live in the South does not in any sense make it a southern problem.

If disease and lawlessness and ignorance are allowed to exist in one part of the country, its contagion will rapidly spread to all parts of the country. No section of the United States can permit a recognized wrong to exist without affecting the whole Nation as well as itself.

Every time a negro is treated unjustly, precisely as is true when a white man is treated unjustly, it affects the whole body politic, and if that injustice spreads and becomes a habit, it presents a serious national problem.

The inequality in the provision for the education of the two races in some sections of the country is appalling. In 1911 and 1912 the figures which I have been able to obtain indicate that the average amount spent in the South for education of children between the ages of 6 and 14 was \$10.32 for white children and \$2.89 for black children. The greatest discrepancy was in Louisiana, where \$13.73 was spent for every white child and only \$1.31 for each black child.

The report of the United States Commissioner of Education for 1916 shows that 87.2 per cent of the amount spent for agricultural and vocational training in the South was used for white men, and but 12.8 per cent to increase the working efficiency of the negro.

The result in illiteracy is to be expected; 48.4 per cent of the colored population is illiterate, against 14.4 per cent of illiteracy among the white population, and yet in the half century just past the general per cent of illiteracy among the negro race in the United States has been reduced from 95 per cent to about 50 per cent.

Education, fair labor conditions, and full opportunity for personal development, together with condemnation and prevention of lynching, protection of the home, and of the ballot are the fair demands of the negro.

The same method of reformation and opportunity should be opened to the younger colored boy and girl, who offends for the first time against the law, as is open to the white boy or girl under similar circumstances.

Equality of opportunity, equality before the law, equality in the sight of God, and not equality in social relationship, is the demand and the right of the colored man.

The intelligent colored man is as much determined to preserve the integrity of his race as is the intelligent white man.

Undoubtedly there are radical, hate-engendered utterances made by colored men in the excitement of race discrimination, but they are no more indicative of the sentiment of the great body of the negro people than are the same kind of utterances of which we read with indignation and anxiety when uttered by white men. There must be a recognition of the rights of the colored man as a condition to the fair and permanent solution of the race question.

The church, the school, the development of industrial and agricultural life, the playgrounds for colored children, and the legitimate recreations for colored adults are factors neither to be overlooked nor hampered.

As Bishop Calloway once stated:

The race question is not a question for small politicians, but for broad-minded patriotic statesmen. It is not for theorists, but for clear-visioned humanitarians. All our dealings with the negro should be in the spirit of the Man of Galilee.

The race question is not a political question; it is an American question.

The railroads have no more right to furnish to negro patrons at precisely the same cost per mile of travel accommodations of an inferior quality than that which they furnish to a white man than the grocer or druggist has to furnish to the colored man at precisely the same price an inferior article to that which he sells to the white man. Equal accommodation, not joint use of cars, is the demand.

The colored boy has precisely the same right to an education that the white boy has.

His treatment in the courts, both by trial and by punishment, ought to be influenced alone by the same considerations as are used in connection with the trial and punishment of white men.

There is a need and a place for the colored man on the farm, in the shop, in the school. There is a need of the colored doctor, the colored lawyer, the colored minister, the colored teacher, the colored professional man in every vocation of life precisely as there is a need of white men in similar occupations.

You can not make the white man happy by making the negro unhappy, nor can you safeguard the virtue of one race by destroying the virtue of another. You can not deal unjustly with the black man without an equally deteriorating effect upon the white man.

The negro is essentially religious and patriotic and in these two approaches is the path to the solution of the race question. There is equality in the sight of God and there is equality before the law, and neither of these opens the door in the slightest way to an impairment of the integrity of either the white or the colored race.

The colored man has a pride in his race, in its history, and in its achievement, and a hope and confidence for its future which is, and by right ought to be, the equal of the pride of the white man in his race and in the hope of its future.

Brute force or superiority in numbers furnishes no basis for a violation of the rights of the weak or of the minority. We must consider the negro as an American, with constitutional guaranties of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, precisely equal to those same guaranties in the case of the white man.

Punishment for wrongdoing ought to be as prompt and severe with the colored wrongdoer as with the white wrongdoer, but there is no justification either in history or in result for lawless punishment of either white or black any more than there is any justification for either a direct or a camouflaged violation of the constitutional right which the colored man has to vote and to have his vote counted.

If the colored man is deemed worthy to carry a rifle in the defense of his country and to risk his life for the honor of his

nation, who shall say that he is unworthy to cast a ballot in the government of that nation whose life he has helped to preserve?

These principles lie at the foundation of the consideration and determination of the racial question in the Nation. It is a question that must be settled, and it must be settled right.

More than 1 out of every 10 in the United States is a colored individual, and every reason of national welfare demands a fair, sane consideration of the question. It is useless to close our eyes to the fact that there is a widespread feeling of discontent and of hatred in the hearts of the colored citizens of the United States. Much of this is occasioned by misunderstanding; some of it is entirely well founded.

The question can never be adequately solved without representation of the white man of the South in its solution. The white man of the South has been longest identified with the colored man, is more familiar with his characteristics, and when he approaches the solution of the question, apart from prejudice, he is apt to propose the wisest and sanest plan.

In any body that deals with the question there must, of course, be the representatives of the colored race itself. By every right of representation, by every recognition of educational advancement, by every reason of common fairness they should and they must have a part in the consideration and determination of the question which has to do with their own race.

The white man of the North, while lacking in experience in the question, has the advantage of a certain impartiality, and the combination of the white man of the South and the white man of the North and the colored man produces the commission which ought to consider this question. It is precisely such a commission that is provided for in the Senate bill.

ARMY APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13587) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, in connection with the point of order that I have raised covering a portion of the amendment on page 33, I have conferred with the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, and desire to suggest adding to the amendment certain words which I believe will meet in great part the objection that I have had. The suggestion that I have made, I believe, meets with the chairman's approval.

On page 33, line 18, after the word "the," I move to amend by inserting the word "joint," so that it will read "That in the joint discretion." On the same line, after the word "War," I move to insert the words "and chairman of the Shipping Board," which will make the clause read:

Provided further, That in the joint discretion of the Secretary of War and chairman of the Shipping Board, and when space is available—

And so forth. My object in that is very obvious. I believe that we should encourage cooperation between departments, especially when they are apparently, as provided in this section, engaged in similar and cognate responsibilities.

I believe that the objection I made will be obviated if the Secretary of War confers with the chairman of the Shipping Board, because if the Shipping Board are conducting a service there that is adequate he will make it known. If not I have no objection whatever to having the Transport Service of the United States furnish any service that may be lacking. I wish to repeat, however, that I am fundamentally opposed to the Government entering into business that can be taken care of by the private business interests of our country.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 33, line 18, in the committee amendment, before the word "discretion," it is proposed to insert the word "joint," and after the word "war" it is proposed to insert the words "and chairman of the Shipping Board."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. EDGE. Now, Mr. President, I withdraw the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is withdrawn. The question is on the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, I send to the desk, in order that it may be printed, an amendment which I propose to offer to the bill now under consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be printed and lie on the table. The Secretary will continue the reading of the bill. The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was of the Committee on Military Affairs, under the subhead of "Clothing and camp and garrison equipage," on page 35, line 8, after the words "due to," to insert "warrant officers of the Mine Planter Service and to," and in line 21, after the word "exceeding," to strike out "\$25" and insert "\$40," so as to make the clause read:

For cloth, woollens, materials, and for the purchase and manufacture of clothing for the Army, including retired enlisted men when ordered to active duty; for members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps; for issue and for sale at cost price according to the Army regulations; for payment for clothing not drawn due to warrant officers of the Mine Planter Service and to enlisted men on discharge; for altering and fitting clothing and washing and cleaning when necessary; for equipment and repair of equipment of laundries, dry-cleaning plants, salvage and sorting storehouses, hat repairing shops, shoe repair shops, clothing repair shops, and garbage reduction works; for equipage, including authorized issues of toilet articles, barbers' and tailors' materials, for use of general prisoners confined at military posts without pay or allowances and applicants for enlistment while held under observation; issue of toilet kits to recruits upon their first enlistment, and issue of house-wives to the Army; for expenses of packing and handling and similar necessities for a suit of citizen's outer clothing, to cost not exceeding \$40, to be issued to each soldier discharged otherwise than honorably; to each enlisted man convicted by civil court for an offense resulting in confinement in a penitentiary or other civil prison; and to each enlisted man ordered interned by reason of the fact that he is an alien enemy, or, for the same reason, discharged without internment; for indemnity to officers and men of the Army for clothing and bedding, etc., destroyed since April 22, 1898, by order of medical officers of the Army for sanitary reasons, \$19,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, after line 6, to insert:

That all the money hereinbefore designated under the titles "Subsistence of the Army," "Regular supplies, Quartermaster Corps," "Incidental expenses, Quartermaster Corps," "Transportation of the Army and its supplies," "Water and sewers at military posts," "Clothing and camp and garrison equipage" shall be disbursed and accounted for as "General appropriations, Quartermaster Corps," and for that purpose shall constitute one fund.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Horses for Cavalry, Artillery, Engineers," etc., on page 37, line 9, before the words "a maximum," to strike out "at" and insert "within," so as to read:

For the purchase of horses of ages, sex, and size as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War for remounts for officers entitled to public mounts for the Cavalry, Artillery, Signal Corps, and Engineers, the United States Military Academy, service schools, and staff colleges, and for the Indian Scouts, and for such Infantry and members of the Medical Department in field campaigns as may be required to be mounted, and the expenses incident thereto, \$1,500,000; *Provided*, That the number of horses purchased under this appropriation, added to the number now on hand, shall be limited to the actual needs of the mounted service, including reasonable provisions for remounts, and unless otherwise ordered by the Secretary of War, no part of this appropriation shall be paid out for horses not purchased by contract after competition duly invited by the Quartermaster Corps and an inspection under the direction and authority of the Secretary of War. When practicable, horses shall be purchased in open market at all military posts or stations, when needed, within a maximum price to be fixed by the Secretary of War.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Barracks and quarters," on page 39, line 17, after the words "United States," to strike out "\$10,000,000" and insert "\$7,500,000," so as to read:

For barracks, quarters, stables, storehouses, magazines, administration and office buildings, sheds, shops, and other buildings necessary for the shelter of troops, public animals, and stores, and for administration purposes, except those pertaining to the Coast Artillery; for construction or reclamation plants; for constructing and repairing public buildings at military posts; for hire of employees; for rental of the authorized allowance of quarters for officers, including members of the Officers' Reserve Corps when ordered to active duty, on duty with the troops at posts and stations where no public quarters are available; of barracks or authorized allowance of quarters for non-commissioned officers and enlisted men, men on duty where public quarters are not available, including enlisted men of the Regular Army Reserve, retired enlisted men, and members of the enlisted Reserve Corps when ordered to active duty; for grounds for cantonments, camp sites, and other military purposes, and for buildings or portions of buildings for occupation by troops, for use as stables, storehouses, and offices, and for other military purposes; for the hire of recruiting stations and lodgings for recruits; for such furniture for the public rooms of officers' messes and for officers' quarters at military posts as may be approved by the Secretary of War; for wall lockers in permanent barracks and refrigerators in barracks and quarters; for screen doors, window screens, storm doors and sash, and window shades for barracks, offices and quarters, and for flooring and framing for tents, and for the National Guard when called or drafted into the service of the United States, \$7,500,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, line 17, after the figures "\$7,500,000," to strike out the following proviso: "*Provided*, That not to exceed the following sums may be used in the erection and completion of buildings enumerated at the places named—\$404,256 for motor-training school buildings at Fort Leavenworth, Kans.; \$600,000 for construction of officers' and noncommissioned officers' quarters, and the repair and remodeling of such existing buildings as may be available for such quarters at Fort Leavenworth, Kans."

Mr. CURTIS. I ask that the amendment striking out the proviso on page 39 may be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was continued.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Military post exchanges," on page 41, line 3, after the words "Secretary of War," to strike out "\$400,000" and insert "\$600,000," and in the same line, after "\$600,000," to strike out "Provided, That of the unexpended balance remaining June 3, 1920, allotted to 'Military post exchanges' for continuing the construction, equipment, and maintenance of suitable buildings at military posts and stations for the conduct of the post exchange, school, library, reading, lunch, amusement rooms, and gymnasium under an act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, approved July 9, 1918, there is hereby reappropriated and made available until June 30, 1921, for the completion of a Liberty theater at Camp Knox, Ky., the sum of \$78,000," so as to make the clause read:

For continuing the construction, equipment, and maintenance of suitable buildings at military posts and stations for the conduct of the post exchange, school, library, reading, lunch, amusement rooms, and gymnasium, including repairs to buildings erected at private cost, in the operation of the act approved May 31, 1902, for the rental of films, purchase of slides, supplies for and making repairs to moving-picture outfits and for similar and other recreational purposes at training and mobilization camps now established, or which may be hereafter established, and for such purposes not enumerated above as the Secretary of War may deem advisable, to be expended in the discretion and under the direction of the Secretary of War, \$600,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Barracks and quarters, Philippine Islands," on page 41, line 23, after the word "China," to strike out "\$250,000" and insert "\$300,000," so as to make the clause read:

Continuing the work of providing for the proper shelter and protection of officers and enlisted men of the Army of the United States lawfully on duty in the Philippine Islands, including repairs and payment of rents, the acquisition of title to building sites, and such additions to existing military reservations as may be necessary, and including also shelter for the animals and supplies, and all other buildings necessary for post administration purposes, and for shelter and repair thereof, and rentals for the United States troops in China, \$300,000: *Provided*, That no part of said sum shall be expended for the construction of quarters for officers of the Army the total cost of which, including the heating and plumbing apparatus, wiring, and fixtures, shall exceed in the case of quarters of a general officer the sum of \$8,000; of a colonel or officer above the rank of captain, \$6,000; and of an officer of and below the rank of captain, \$4,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Roads, walks, wharves, and drainage," on page 42, line 11, after the word "Provided," to strike out "That not to exceed \$100 may be used for the purchase of land near terminal of bridge at Deer Island, Boston Harbor, Mass.:" *Provided further*," so as to make the clause read:

For the construction and repair by the Quartermaster Corps of roads, walks, and wharves; for the pay of employees; for the disposal of drainage; for dredging channels; and for care and improvement of grounds at military posts and stations, \$3,000,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated or made available under this act shall be used for the permanent construction or repair of any roads, walks, or wharves connected with any of the National Army cantonments or National Guard camps.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Shooting galleries and ranges," on page 44, line 13, after "\$50,000," to strike out "Provided, That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$88,880 for the acquisition of land as an addition to the Leon Springs Military Reservation in Texas, heretofore authorized, and now in use as a target range for Camp Travis, Tex.," so as to make the clause read:

For shelter, grounds, shooting galleries, ranges for small-arms target practice, machine-gun practice, field-artillery practice, repairs, and expenses incident thereto, including flour for paste for making targets, hire of employees, such ranges and galleries to be open as far as practicable to the National Guard and organized rifle clubs under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of War, \$50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Rent of buildings, Quartermaster Corps," on page 45, line 10, after "1921," to strike out "\$200,000" and insert "\$212,796," so as to make the clause read:

For rent of buildings and parts of buildings in the District of Columbia for military purposes during the fiscal year 1921, \$212,796: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available if space is provided by the Public Buildings Commission in Government-owned buildings.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Vocational training," on page 45, line 15, after the word "trades," to insert "and for the payment of their traveling expenses, as authorized under existing law"; in line 19, after the words "pur-

chase of," to strike out "material" and insert "materials, live stock (including fowls)"; on page 46, line 8, after the words "mechanic arts," to strike out "\$2,000,000" and insert "\$5,000,000"; and, in line 12, after the word "instructors," to insert: "*Provided further*, That farm products and the increase in live stock (including fowls) which accrue as incidental to vocational training in agriculture and animal husbandry may, notwithstanding any restrictions of existing laws, be sold under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe; and the profits thereof shall continue to be available for the purchase of materials, live stock (including fowls), and other supplies for the instruction of soldiers in agriculture and animal husbandry," so as to make the clause read:

For the employment of the necessary civilian instructors in the most important trades, and for the payment of their traveling expenses, as authorized under existing law; for the purchase of carpenter's, machinist's, mason's, electrician's, and such other tools and equipment as may be required, including machines used in connection with the trades; for the purchase of materials, live stock (including fowls), and other supplies necessary for instruction and training purposes and the construction of such buildings needed for vocational training in agriculture; for shops, storage, and shelter of machinery as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of section 27 of the act approved June 3, 1916, authorizing, in addition to the military training of soldiers while in the active service, means for securing an opportunity to study and receive instruction upon educational lines of such character as to increase their military efficiency and enable them to return to civil life better equipped for industrial, commercial, and general business occupations, part of this instruction to consist of vocational education either in agriculture or the mechanic arts, \$5,000,000: *Provided*, That whenever possible officers, warrant officers, noncommissioned officers, or other enlisted men shall be detailed as instructors in vocational training in the most important trades in lieu of civilian instructors: *Provided further*, That farm products and the increase in live stock (including fowls) which accrue as incidental to vocational training in agriculture and animal husbandry may, notwithstanding any restrictions of existing laws, be sold under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe, and the profits thereof shall continue to be available for the purchase of materials, live stock (including fowls), and other supplies for the instruction of soldiers in agriculture and animal husbandry.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Quartermaster supplies and services for rifle ranges for civilian instruction," on page 47, line 18, after "\$80,000," to insert: "*Provided further*, That hereafter members of civilian rifle teams may, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, be paid, as commutation of traveling expenses, at the rate of 5 cents per mile for the shortest usually traveled route from their homes to national matches, when authorized to participate therein by the Secretary of War, and for the return travel thereto: *Provided further*, That the payment of travel pay for the return journey may be made in advance of the actual performance of travel," so as to make the clause read:

To establish and maintain indoor and outdoor rifle ranges for the use of all able-bodied males capable of bearing arms, under reasonable regulations to be prescribed by the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice and approved by the Secretary of War; for the employment of labor in connection with the establishment of outdoor and indoor rifle ranges, including labor in operating targets; for the employment of instructors; for clerical services; for badges and other insignia; for the transportation of employees, instructors, and civilians to engage in practice; for the purchase of materials, supplies, and services, and for expenses incidental to instruction of citizens of the United States in marksmanship, and their participation in national and international matches, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War, and to remain available until expended, \$100,000: *Provided*, That out of the said sum of \$100,000 there may be expended for the payment of transportation, for supplying meals, or furnishing commutation of subsistence of civilian rifle teams authorized by the Secretary of War to participate in the national matches, not to exceed \$80,000: *Provided further*, That hereafter members of civilian rifle teams may, in the discretion of the Secretary, be paid, as commutation of traveling expenses, at the rate of 5 cents per mile for the shortest usually traveled route from their homes to national matches, when authorized to participate therein by the Secretary of War, and for the return travel thereto: *Provided further*, That the payment of travel pay for the return journey may be made in advance of the actual performance of travel.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Quartermaster supplies, equipment, etc., Reserve Officers' Training Corps," on page 48, line 10, after the word "institutions," to insert "and training camps"; in line 22, after "1916," to strike out "\$2,500,000" and insert "\$3,000,000: *Provided*, That so much of section 48 of the act of June 3, 1916, entitled 'An act for making further and more effectual provisions for the national defense, and for other purposes,' as relates to the transportation of members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps attending summer camps be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to provide that such members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps shall be paid as traveling allowances 5 cents per mile for the distance by the shortest usually traveled route from the places from which they are authorized to proceed to the camp and for the return travel thereto: *Provided further*, That the payment of travel pay for the return journey may be made in advance of the actual performance of travel: *Provided further*, That the Secre-

tary of War may, in his discretion and under such regulations as he may prescribe, permit such institutions to furnish their own uniforms and receive as commutation therefor the sum allotted by the Secretary of War to such institutions for uniforms," so as to make the clause read:

For the procurement and issue, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War, to institutions at which one or more units of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps are maintained, such public animals, uniforms, equipment, and means of transportation as he may deem necessary, and to forage at the expense of the United States public animals so issued; for transporting said animals and other authorized equipment from place of issue to the several institutions and training camps and return of same to place of issue when necessary; for the maintenance of camps for the further practical instruction of the members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and for transporting members of such corps to and from such camps, and to subsist them while traveling to and from such camps and while remaining therein so far as appropriations will permit; for the payment of commutation of subsistence to members of the senior division of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, at such rate, not exceeding the cost of the garrison ration prescribed for the Army, as authorized in the act of Congress approved June 3, 1916, \$3,000,000: *Provided*, That so much of section 48 of the act of June 3, 1916, entitled, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Inland and port storage and shipping facilities," on page 50, line 5, after the word "employees," to strike out "\$10,000,000" and insert "\$100," so as to make the clause read:

For inland and port storage, including all necessary buildings, docks, tracks, handling, and other facilities for Government supplies, including rentals and hire of the necessary employees, \$100.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Bureau of Insular Affairs," subhead "Care of insane Filipino soldiers," on page 52, line 24, after "1908," to strike out "\$1,500" and insert "\$2,000," so as to make the clause read:

For care, maintenance, and treatment at asylums in the Philippine Islands of insane natives of the Philippine Islands cared for in such institutions conformable to the act of Congress approved May 11, 1908, \$2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Engineer Department," subhead "Engineer School," on page 53, line 24, after the word "models," to insert "boats," on page 54, line 1, after the word "and," to strike out "for" and insert "to provide means for the theoretical and practical"; in line 2, after the word "Engineer," to insert "officers and"; in line 4, after the words "binding of," to insert "scientific and"; in line 5, after the word "works," to insert "papers"; in the same line, after the word "periodicals," to strike out "of recent date"; in line 6, before the word "engineering," to strike out "and civil"; in the same line, before the word "scientific," to strike out "kindred"; in line 7, after the word "subjects," to insert "textbooks and books of reference"; and in line 17, after the word "allowances," to strike out "and to provide means for the theoretical and practical instruction at the Engineer School by the purchase of textbooks, books of reference, scientific and professional papers," so as to make the clause read:

Equipment and maintenance of the Engineer School, including purchase and repair of instruments, machinery, implements, models, boats, and materials for the use of the school and to provide means for the theoretical and practical instruction of Engineer officers and troops in their special duties as sappers and miners; for land mining, pontooning, and signaling; for purchase and binding of scientific and professional works, papers, and periodicals treating on military, engineering, and scientific subjects, textbooks, and books of reference for the library of the United States Engineer School; for incidental expenses of the school, including chemicals, stationery, hardware, machinery, and boats; for pay of civilian clerks, draftsmen, electricians, mechanics, and laborers; compensation of civilian lecturers and payment of tuition fees of student officers at civil technical institutions; for unforeseen expenses; for travel expenses of officers on journeys approved by the Secretary of War and made for the purpose of instruction, \$40,000: *Provided*, That the traveling expenses herein provided for shall be in lieu of mileage and other allowances, and for other absolutely necessary expenses: *Provided further*, That section 3648, Revised Statutes, shall not apply to subscriptions for foreign and professional newspapers and periodicals to be paid for from this appropriation.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, by the courtesy of the chairman of the committee I am permitted to interrupt and offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. It is proposed by the Senator from Missouri to insert at the end of the bill the following:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay to Blanche Winters, widow of Charles F. Winters, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, out of any moneys in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$25,000 as compensation and relief for the loss, by death, on January 11, 1918, at Camp Funston, in the State of Kansas, of her husband, Charles F. Winters, who, while engaged in the discharge of his duty, in conducting the camp bank at Camp Funston, in the State of Kansas, and

in protecting the money and funds of the Government of the United States of America and of the soldiers of the United States Army, was killed by Louis R. Whistler, a commissioned officer and captain of Company E, Three hundred and fifty-fourth Infantry Regiment, Eighty-ninth Division, of the Army of the United States.

Mr. WADSWORTH. May I ask the Senator from Missouri whether it is intended that the amendment shall carry a \$25,000 appropriation?

Mr. REED. It ought to do so; but if the chairman of the committee thinks that is too large I am so anxious to get something for this widow that if he suggests a reduction I will accept it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The matter might be adjusted in conference. I would suggest \$15,000 instead of \$25,000.

Mr. REED. If the Senator suggests \$15,000, it may go at that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be so modified.

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs was, under the head of "Engineer equipment of troops," on page 55, line 8, after the word "equipment," to strike out "\$150,000" and insert "\$300,000: *Provided*, That the services of skilled draftsmen, civil engineers, and such other services as the Secretary of War may deem necessary may be employed only in the office of the Chief of Engineers to carry into effect the various appropriations for 'Engineer equipment of troops,' 'Engineer operations in the field,' and other military appropriations, to be paid from such appropriations: *Provided further*, That the expenditures on this account for the fiscal year 1920 shall not exceed \$225,000. The Secretary of War shall each year, in the annual estimates, report to Congress the number of persons who are employed, their duties, and amount paid to each," so as to make the clause read:

For pontoon materials, tools, instruments, supplies, and appliances required for use in the engineer equipment of troops, for military surveys, and for engineer operations in the field, including the purchase, maintenance, operation, and repair of the necessary motor cycles; the purchase and preparation of engineer manuals and procurement of special paper for same, and for a reserve supply of above equipment, \$300,000: *Provided*, That the services of skilled draftsmen, civil engineers, and such other services as the Secretary of War may deem necessary may be employed only in the office of the Chief of Engineers to carry into effect the various appropriations for "Engineer equipment of troops," "Engineer operations in the field," and other military appropriations, to be paid from such appropriations: *Provided further*, That the expenditures on this account for the fiscal year 1920 shall not exceed \$225,000. The Secretary of War shall each year, in the annual estimates, report to Congress the number of persons who are employed, their duties, and amount paid to each.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I desire to perfect the amendment by making certain changes in line 17 of the printed amendment. I move to strike out the numerals "1920" and insert "1921," and in the same line I move to strike out the numerals "\$225,000" and insert "\$175,000."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Engineer operations in the field," on page 56, line 13, after the word "field," to insert "*Provided further*, That so much of this appropriation as is necessary to provide facilities for engineer training of troops may be expended for military construction work at camps and cantonments and in training areas," so as to make the clause read:

For expenses incident to military engineer operations in the field, including the purchase of material and a reserve of material for such operations, the construction or rental of storehouses within and outside the District of Columbia; the operation, maintenance, and repair of horse-drawn and motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, and such expenses as are ordinarily provided for under appropriations for "Engineer depots," "Civilian assistants to engineer officers," and "Maps, War Department," \$500,000: *Provided*, That when to the interest of the Government funds appropriated under this head may be used for the purchase of options on material for use in engineer operations in the field: *Provided further*, That so much of this appropriation as is necessary to provide facilities for engineer training of troops may be expended for military construction work at camps and cantonments and in training areas.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Construction and maintenance of military and post roads, bridges, and trails, Alaska," on page 57, line 13, after the word "available," to strike out "\$150,000" and insert "\$422,200," so as to make the clause read:

For the construction, repair, and maintenance of military and post roads, bridges, and trails, Territory of Alaska, to be immediately available, \$422,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Ordnance department," subhead "Ordnance service," on page 57, line 24, after the word "stores," to insert "for instruction purposes," and on page 58, line 5, after the word "vehicles," to strike out

"\$4,000,000" and insert "\$6,000,000," so as to make the clause read:

For the current expenses of the Ordnance Department in connection with purchasing, receiving, storing, and issuing ordnance and ordnance stores, comprising police and office duties, rents, tolls, fuel, light, water, and advertising, stationery, typewriters, and adding machines, including their exchange, and office furniture, tools, and instruments of service; for incidental expenses of the Ordnance Service, and those attending practical trials and tests of ordnance, small arms, and other ordnance stores; for instruction purposes; for publications for libraries of the Ordnance Department, including the Ordnance Office; subscriptions to periodicals, which may be paid for in advance; and payment for mechanical labor in the office of the Chief of Ordnance; and for maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled or horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles, \$6,000,000: *Provided*, That no money appropriated herein shall be expended for maintenance, repair, or operation of any motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle employed wholly or in part for personal, social, or other similar use, or for any use except for military and official business: *Provided further*, That all material purchased under the appropriations in this act for the Ordnance Department of the United States Army shall be of American manufacture, except in cases when, in the judgment of the Secretary of War, it is to the manifest interest of the United States to make purchases abroad, which material shall be admitted free of duty.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead of "Ordnance stores and supplies," on page 59, line 26, after the word "troops," to strike out "\$1,000,000" and insert "\$590,055," so as to make the clause read:

For the manufacture, test, purchase, and maintenance of sighting devices for airplane bombs, of carrying and releasing devices for airplane bombs; for overhauling, cleaning, repairing, and preserving ordnance and ordnance stores in the hands of troops and at the arsenals, posts, and depots; for purchase and manufacture of ordnance stores to fill requisitions of troops, \$590,055.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Automatic machine rifles," on page 60, line 19, after the word "manufacture," to insert "to remain available until June 30, 1922," so as to make the clause read:

For the purchase, manufacture, test, repair, and maintenance of automatic machine rifles, or other automatic or semiautomatic guns, including their mounts, sights, and equipments, and the machinery necessary for their manufacture, to remain available until June 30, 1922, \$500,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Tanks," on page 60, line 23, after the word "vehicles," to insert "to remain available until June 30, 1922," so as to make the clause read:

For the purchase, manufacture, test, maintenance, and repair of tanks and other self-propelled armored vehicles, to remain available until June 30, 1922, \$500,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 61, to insert:

That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to dispose, by sale, of the cannon-finishing plant known as the Erie Howitzer Plant, at Erie, Pa., and to use not to exceed \$950,000 of the proceeds of the sale of said plant for the erection, at Watervliet Arsenal, Watervliet, N. Y., on Government-owned land, of a plant for machining and assembling medium-caliber types of field cannon and to remove to Watervliet Arsenal the machinery and equipment now installed or stored at the Erie Howitzer Plant; and that all the proceeds of sale of the Erie Howitzer Plant in excess of \$950,000 shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of "Miscellaneous receipts."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, after line 12, to insert:

That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to establish an arsenal to be known as the Aberdeen Ammunition Arsenal on land owned by the United States, situate in the county of Harford, State of Maryland, and within the tract now designated as the Aberdeen Proving Ground Reservation; to erect such permanent buildings as may be required for the establishment of that arsenal; to acquire by purchase or condemnation such additional lands or interests therein, including riparian rights, easements, and rights of way, and other rights as may be necessary to provide an adequate water supply for said arsenal; all at a total cost, exclusive of material and machinery now owned by the Government, of not to exceed \$5,500,000, to be paid from the net proceeds derived from the disposition by sale or otherwise of such parts of the Government plants, surplus supplies, and equipment, except land at Tullytown, Pa., Amatol, N. J., and Jacksonville, Tenn., as are not required; the money thus obtained to be immediately available and to continue available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Chemical Warfare Service," on page 62, line 12, after "1921," to strike out "for the purchase of material, plant and machinery, the employment of labor, and other operations connected therewith, for the manufacture of defensive equipment and matériel for chemical warfare purposes, \$1,500,000," and insert "for the purchase, manufacture, and test of chemical warfare gases or other toxic substances, gas masks, or other offensive or defensive materials or appliances required for gas warfare purposes, including all necessary investigation, experimentation, and operations connected therewith, construction and repair of buildings and equipment and the machinery therefor, expenses incidental to the organization and training of gas troops not otherwise provided for, \$2,000,000: *Provided*, That mileage to

officers and actual traveling expenses to civilian employees of the Chemical Warfare Service, traveling on duty in connection with that service, shall be paid from the appropriation for the work in connection with which the travel is performed," so as to make the clause read:

That of the unexpended balance remaining June 30, 1920, allotted to the Chemical Warfare Service under the appropriation "Medical and Hospital Department, 1919," there is hereby made immediately available and to remain available during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, for the purchase, manufacture, and test of chemical warfare gases or other toxic substances, gas masks, or other offensive or defensive materials or appliances required for gas warfare purposes, including all necessary investigation, experimentation, and operations connected therewith, construction and repair of buildings and equipment and the machinery therefor, expenses incidental to the organization and training of gas troops not otherwise provided for, \$2,000,000: *Provided*, That mileage to officers and actual traveling expenses to civilian employees of the Chemical Warfare Service, traveling on duty in connection with that service, shall be paid from the appropriation for the work in connection with which the travel is performed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the "Civilian military training camps," on page 67, line 10, to strike out:

For arms and ordnance equipment, including overhauling and repairing of personal equipments, machine-gun outfits, horse equipment; ammunition, targets, and other accessories for target practice; and for overhauling and repairing arms for issue and use in connection with training camps for civilians in pursuance of the provisions of section 54 of the act entitled "An act for making further and more effective provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, \$250,000: *Provided*, That the funds herein appropriated shall be used for the training of those persons only who are between the ages of 21 and 45 years.

And insert:

For the expense of maintaining, upon military reservations or elsewhere, camps for military instruction and training of such citizens as may be selected and under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War pursuant to section 54 of the act of June 3, 1916, as amended by the act of May 12, 1917, and for furnishing said citizens at the expense of the United States, uniforms, subsistence, and transportation by the most usual and direct routes within said limits as to territory as may be prescribed; for such expenditures as are authorized by said section and may be necessary for the establishment and maintenance of said camps; for furnishing such equipment, tentage, field equipage, and transportation belonging to the United States as may be necessary; for arms and ordnance equipment, including overhauling and repairing of personal equipment, machine-gun outfits, horse equipment, ammunition, targets and their accessories for target practice, and for overhauling and repairing arms for issue and use in connection with said camps, \$250,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Tank Service," on page 69, line 16, after the word "units," to strike out "\$50,000" and insert "\$79,000," so as to make the clause read:

For payment of the necessary civilian employees to assist in handling the clerical work in the office of the Chief of Tank Corps, the various Tank Corps organization headquarters, and Tank Corps schools; and for the payment of the necessary mechanics to assist in repairing and preserving tanks in the hands of Tank Corps units, \$79,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 73, after line 9, to insert:

PURCHASE OF ARMY STORES BY DISCHARGED RECEIVING TREATMENT FROM THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE.

That hereafter honorably discharged officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps who are being cared for and are receiving medical treatment from the Public Health Service shall, while undergoing such care and treatment, be permitted to purchase subsistence stores and articles of other authorized supplies, except articles of the uniform, from the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps at the same price as charged the officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I desire to perfect this amendment. In line 10, after the word "discharged" in the title of the subsection or paragraph, I move to insert the words "officers and enlisted men," so it will read "Purchase of Army stores by discharged officers and enlisted men receiving treatment from the Public Health Service."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 73, after line 20, to insert:

REPAIRING ROAD DAMAGED BY GOVERNMENT MOTOR TRUCKS, TENAFLY, N. J.

That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to enter into a contract with the borough of Tenafly, of the county of Bergen, and State of New Jersey, whereby the said borough shall undertake to grade and pave that portion of Hickory Avenue lying between Knickerbocker Street and Jefferson Street in said borough for the purpose of completing the grading and paving on said Hickory Avenue begun but not completed by the Government during the war with Germany. Such contract shall provide that the said borough will bear one-half or more of the cost of the above work and the Government shall bear not over one-half of the cost of said work: *Provided*, That the share to be borne by the Government shall not exceed \$5,200, and there is hereby appropriated the sum of \$5,200 for said work, to be paid on completion of the work and to be available until expended: *Provided further*, That the said borough shall in said contract assume to pay and discharge all claims arising out of the present uncompleted condition of said Hickory Avenue.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 74, after line 17, to insert:

RIFLES AND ACCESSORIES FOR POSTS OF THE AMERICAN LEGION.

That the act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of War to loan Army rifles to posts of the American Legion, approved February 10, 1920," be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized, under rules, limitations, and regulations to be prescribed by him, to loan obsolete or condemned Army rifles, slings, and cartridge belts to posts of the American Legion for use by them in connection with the funeral ceremonies of deceased soldiers, sailors, and marines, and for other post ceremonial purposes; and to sell to such posts blank ammunition in suitable amounts for said rifles at cost price, plus cost of packing and transportation: *Provided, however,* That not to exceed 10 such rifles shall be issued to any one post."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 75, after line 8, to insert:

That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint Col. William C. Brown, United States Army (retired), to the position and rank of brigadier general on the retired list.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I should like to ask the Senator to state briefly why that amendment with reference to Col. Brown is put in the bill. He is on the retired list now, and the amendment authorizes the President to appoint him a brigadier general on the retired list. Is there any especial reason why that should be done?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I prefer that the Senator from Washington should take that question up with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], who is familiar with it. I may say, and I think I ought to say, that a majority of the members of the Senate Military Committee indicated their wish that this amendment be attached to the bill, and the majority rules. I was in the minority, I may say.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I thought there might be some especial reason for the proposed action.

Mr. WADSWORTH. An inference might be drawn from the remarks which I just made which might be unfair to Col. Brown. My remark was not meant to be taken to intimate that Col. Brown's case is not a worthy one. I imagine, so far as special items of private legislation promoting retired Regular officers from one grade to a higher grade are concerned, this is probably one of the most meritorious.

Mr. JONES of Washington. We do not usually attach them to appropriation bills, however, do we?

Mr. WADSWORTH. We do not usually do so; but it has been done. I have never been enthusiastically in favor of such a practice.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, while I know little in regard to the insertion of the amendment, I may say that Col. Brown was in command of the regiment of Cavalry which pursued Villa in connection with the punitive expedition into Mexico. Although I did not propose the amendment, I know from letters which I have received that Gen. Scott, the former Chief of Staff, and others are backing Col. Brown strongly. Of course, he did make that ride of sixty-odd miles with the first regiment on the first day of the expedition; and undoubtedly he was an excellent officer and performed good service as such on the active list.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I warn the Senator from Washington that there are going to be quite a number of such items offered to this bill, and if all go in the bill it will cease to be a military appropriation bill; it will not be even an omnibus bill, but will be a moving van.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is what I thought. If we start putting such provisions in this bill, there will be a flood of them not only at this session but hereafter.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from New York if it would not be well to let this item go over, allow the Senate to adjourn, and take up the amendments passed over the first thing on Monday morning?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Certainly; I think that would be an excellent proceeding.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the amendment go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

Mr. McKELLAR. I was about to make the request that the amendment go over. The Senator from Colorado is not here, and I think it should go over on his account, as he is a member of the committee. I myself am opposed to promoting officers on the retired list, and expect so to vote; but I think it is only fair to the Senator from Colorado that he should be given an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 22, after line 16, it is proposed to insert:

That warrant officers of the Army Mine Planter Service shall receive the same pay and increases as now are or hereafter may be prescribed for warrant officers in the Navy.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, in the bill increasing Army and Navy pay the warrant officers referred to in the amendments were inadvertently omitted, and the amendment merely puts them upon the same basis as other warrant officers.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am in hearty sympathy with the purpose of the amendment, and so far as it is in my power I accept it on behalf of the committee. Then when it goes to conference any little kink there may be about their pay adjustment can be straightened out.

Mr. LENROOT. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. LENROOT. I inquire if the amendment on page 61 was agreed to with reference to arsenals?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes. Would the Senator like to have them go over?

Mr. LENROOT. I would just as lief talk about them now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from Wisconsin that they were agreed to.

Mr. LENROOT. I should like to discuss the amendments to some extent.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Does the Senator desire to discuss them now or on Monday?

Mr. SMOOT. I suggest that they be taken up on Monday. The Senator can ask unanimous consent to reconsider the votes by which they were agreed to.

Mr. LENROOT. I ask unanimous consent that the votes whereby the amendments on page 61 down to line 6, on page 62, were agreed to may be reconsidered and that the amendments go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the votes whereby the amendments were agreed to are reconsidered, and the amendments will be passed over.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I have several amendments which I should like to offer, to one of which I should like to call the attention of Senators, because it is of some importance. The others are not so important. On page 6, line 13, after the word "department," I move to insert the word "armies."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. At the end of the same line, after the word "tactical," I move to insert the word "corps."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. On line 22, after the word "districts," I move to insert the word "armies."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Now, I send to the desk an amendment, which I ask the Secretary to read. I call the attention of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 34, line 1, after the word "receipts," it is proposed to insert:

Provided further, That authority is hereby granted the Secretary of War to sell or otherwise dispose of in accordance with law and regulations the United States Army transports *Sherman, Sheridan, Thomas, Logan, Buford, Kipatrik, Crook, and Warren*: And *provided further,* That \$2,400,000 of the sum derived from such sale may be used for the purpose of reimbursing the United States Shipping Board for necessary improvements and alterations to the 12 transports now being constructed by the United States Shipping Board for the use of the War Department as permanent transports to replace the aforementioned United States Army transports of which the sale is authorized herein.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, just a word of explanation. I think there will be no objection to the amendment, as the transports named in the amendment are all 20 years old or more. The Government acquired them during the Spanish-American War. I know something about their age and their type, as I have traveled on three of them. They have performed a remarkable service, I may say, but they are worn out, and it costs an extraordinary sum of money to keep them in repair. Every time they finish a long trip there is a big repair bill. They are also out of date.

During the war with Germany the Shipping Board made arrangements with the War Department to include in its ship-building program the construction of some modern transports for the Army's use. Those ships—12, I think, in number—are nearly finished. It is proposed in this amendment to sell these old Army transports. They will fetch a reasonably good sum, I think, although they are old, because the demand—at least for ships of their tonnage—is very heavy; and from the proceeds of the sale it is proposed that the War Department shall reimburse the Shipping Board in the amount necessary to complete the new model transports which the Shipping Board is now building for the War Department. I think it is a good business proposition to get rid of those old ships just as soon as possible.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Are they foreign-built ships?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think all, or nearly all, of them are foreign built. I know the *Sherman*, the *Sheridan*, and one other are, for they are sister ships, and were built at Belfast, as I happen to remember.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The reason I asked the question is this: In the shipping bill as we passed it there is a provision authorizing the sale of any foreign-built ships owned by the Navy Department; and if after such sale they are owned wholly by citizens of this country they can be used in the coastwise trade. There was no suggestion that the Army had any vessels which they desired to sell; and it occurred to me that it would be wise to put a similar provision in the amendment with reference to the Army transports which it is proposed to sell.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The amendment provides that the transports shall be sold "in accordance with law and regulations."

Mr. JONES of Washington. Of course, under the law now, if a ship is foreign built, it can not be used in the coastwise trade; and the transports referred to would bring a better price, very likely, if they could be sold with that privilege. Their number is small and they are of comparatively low tonnage; and I think it would be well to put a provision in the bill with reference to them similar to the provision that we adopted with reference to the naval vessels authorizing such ships, when sold and wholly owned by American citizens, to be used in the coastwise trade. I suggest that the amendment go over until Monday.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator believes that without such a provision in the proposed amendment the transports, when sold, could not be used in the coastwise trade?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think not.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I know at least three of them were foreign built.

Mr. WARREN. I think that was because America had no shipping in those days.

Mr. WADSWORTH. We certainly had not. They were purchased from the Atlantic Transport Line, and were built at Belfast, Ireland.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask that the amendment may go over until Monday so that provision may be made as I have indicated, in which event, I think, the ships will bring more money.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Very well, I will not press the amendment. I ask to have it printed and lie on the table, and I shall call it up again.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator in charge of the bill what action was taken on the amendment on page 44, lines 13 to 19?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It was adopted, there having been no objection to it. Does the Senator want to have it go over?

Mr. SHEPPARD. In view of the fact that a similar amendment as to land in Michigan has gone over, I ask that the vote whereby the amendment on page 44 was agreed to be reconsidered, and that the amendment go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote whereby the amendment was agreed to is reconsidered, and the amendment will be passed over.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, May 24, 1920, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, May 22, 1920.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Edward Lawrence Hunt, pastor of the Roosevelt Church, memorial to America's legions of the World War, offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, fountain of life and truth, from whom are derived all our powers and faculties, bless, we beseech Thee, the labors of Thy servants in this place. Endow them richly with wisdom and courage, with a love of righteousness and truth.

In this exceeding high mountain, with outlook upon all the nations of the earth, when the tempter who came to the Son of Man comes to them with the old mammon temptation, "All these things will I give thee if Thou wilt fall down," may Thy grace be sufficient for them that they may stand with the Son of God as sons of God.

And in the war still raging more alarmingly now than on the battle fields of France—against the spiritual hosts of wick-

edness in high places—may grace conquer greed; may Calvary conquer Kultur. Lead our Congressmen to victory in this strategic center of the world, as Thou didst lead our boys over there.

In the riches of Thy grace help any who may have fallen down into bondage to mammon to rise and reign with God upon the earth. So may they inspire every citizen in this Kingdom of God to hold fast that which he has (or may have) that no one take his crown of life.

"Great God our King," we thank Thee for giving us a part in making this Government of God a model for the world.

Help these servants of America to but keep God's model safe that other nations may rise from chaos or despotism to take the mold. Help them on earth's highest hill to be faithful to hold high the banner all of whose ample folds are blazing with the holy light of ordered liberty under Thy law—every star shining as the Star of Bethlehem, mankind's morning star of hope, herald of the dawn.

Guide our people to walk and work in its light. So may nations come to our light that Thy way may be known upon earth, Thy saving health among all nations—as Thou dost bless us and cause Thy face to shine upon us in the face of Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. McARTHUR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a report of the United States attorney at Portland, Ore., in the matter of the investigation of the case of Max H. Houser, the district head of the United States Grain Corporation at Portland, Ore.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is the gentleman prepared to give any other evidence in favor of Mr. Houser than that of the district attorney?

Mr. McARTHUR. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to give the evidence submitted by the United States attorney to the Department of Justice. It is a very conclusive and complete vindication of Mr. Houser from the unfounded and unwarranted attacks made upon him through the baseless accusations of the Federal grand jury at Spokane. Mr. Houser is one of the leading citizens of my community.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman also put in a few remarks about the great victory for clean government that has just been had in Oregon through the reelection of the distinguished gentleman from Oregon [Mr. McARTHUR] in spite of the vicious and unwarranted fight made there against him?

Mr. McARTHUR. Oh, that is beside the issue.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, how long a document is this?

Mr. McARTHUR. It will occupy about a page and a half in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for not to exceed five minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, upon what subject?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter that amounts almost to a question of personal privilege.

Mr. WALSH. I withdraw my reservation of the right to object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago the Grand Army of the Republic, the Spanish-American War Veterans, and the American Legion extended to me an invitation to make a Memorial Day address on May 31 at Ashtabula, Ohio. I accepted this invitation to be present upon that occasion. The Ashtabula Star-Beacon, which is the paper of that community, published a notice that I would make the memorial address, which was to be held in the cemetery among the graves of the dead heroes. I have here the official organ of the Plumb Plan League, a newspaper called Labor, published here at Washington. In the edition of that paper dated May 22, 1920, I find the following article:

SPEAK GENTLY, BROTHER, THE FUNERAL IS PASSING.

"Not long ago," writes H. E. Hammond, of Ashtabula, Ohio, "Congressman JOHN C. COOPER, of this district, sang his swan song by attacking labor and ignoring his protestations of loyalty. Now, please note that his death as a Representative is to be fittingly observed by